This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

F. .44

Non de errore neque in dolo

James Hardy Ropes

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE GIFT OF

ALICE · LOWELL · ROPES

1933

ANDOVER–HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

91
[illegible] [illegible]

James Hardy Ropes

Cambridge
27 May 1907

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
H 56.034
S
Dec. 4, 1922

COPYRIGHT 1906 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Entered at Stationers' Hall

Published May 1906

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
I. Introduction: The Roman Conquest a Disaster to Hellenism 1
II. Hellenism in Inner Asia 19
III. Hellenism in Upper Egypt 40
IV. Hellenism in Syria and in Lower Egypt . . 59
V. The Acclimatisation of Greek Philosophy in Roman Society 86
VI. The General Reaction of Hellenism upon Rome . 106
VII. The Hellenism of Cicero and His Friends . . 144
VIII. The Period of the Roman Civil Wars—from Cicero to Augustus 184
IX. Ascetic Religion in the First Century . . . 213
X. Western Hellenism under the Early Roman Empire—Colonisation 224
XI. The Remaining Hellenism of Italy (Chiefly Magna Græcia) 243
XII. Eastern Hellenism under the Early Roman Empire 261
XIII. The Condition of Greece from Augustus to Vespasian—the Hellenism of the Early Emperors 296
XIV. Plutarch and His Times—Public Life . . . 339
XV. Plutarch and His Times—Private Life . . . 373
XVI. Eastern Hellenism under the Flavian House . 403
XVII. The Literature of the First Century . . . 421

APPENDICES 453
INDEX 461

regenerate the distracted world by the potent influence of Hellenistic culture.

A world-empire, including all the lands and nations about the Mediterranean Sea, reaching to the frozen North and the torrid South as its natural limits, exchanging the virgin ores of Spain for the long-sought spices of Araby the blest, was therefore no very wild imagination. But while those that had conceived it and striven for it consciously had failed, who could have imagined that it should drop almost suddenly, unexpectedly, by the force, not of genius, but of circumstances, into the hands of a people who attained it, not by the direction of an Alexander, but by such national qualities as had gained for Sparta precedence and respect, coupled with aggressive wars under the guise of securing ever-widening frontiers, such as those which mark the rapid strides of Philip's Macedonia?

Any political thinker who witnessed this mighty outcome of half a century might indeed feel uneasy at the result, if he were not, like most of the Stoics, an optimist or a fatalist. There was, no doubt, the manifest gain of a great peace throughout the world, of the real settlement of disputes by the arbitration of an umpire with power to enforce his will; there was the consequent development of wide commerce, with its diffusion, not only of wealth, but of enlightenment. These material gains were indisputable, even though a dangerous monopoly was being established, not merely through the enormous advantages inseparable from Roman influence, but by the jealous destruction of all those commercial centres which might have rivalled Rome by reason of favoured situation or old *traditions* of trade.

never yet failed to bring upon themselves their due reward.

So it was that the completed conquest which Polybius saw,[1] and which appeared to be a final settlement of the world, brought no contentment into the hearts of men. For while the position of the few, of the dominant class at Rome, was magnified beyond their wildest expectations, the condition of the many was not only made worse, but almost intolerable. This is the key to those disturbances in the Roman world which could not indeed shake off the yoke, but which showed the sores which the friction of that yoke had inflicted.

The first symptom was the Slave War which broke out in Sicily very few years after the so-called pacification of the world by the ruin of Carthage and of Corinth in 146 B. C. I have endeavoured in a special monograph to explain the causes and character of this outbreak,[2] and will therefore content myself with here giving the results.

We find it always remarked, whenever an invasion discloses to us the condition of the territory of Carthage, that nothing was more wonderful than the fertility of the farms and homesteads in that favoured land. Its natural gifts were so enhanced by intelligent cultivation that the Italians at once saw and confessed their inferiority, and upon the fall of Carthage we hear that the Senate, probably after some delay, ordered the translation of the received handbook on agriculture long current in that

---

[1] I have given his evidence in detail in the last chapter of my *Greek Life and Thought*, which brings the subject up to the period treated in this book.

[2] In *Hermathena*, Vol. VII (1890).

A further attempt was made, apparently in connection with the colonising efforts of Caius Gracchus, to instruct the more cultivated settlers—for Gracchus did not send out the mere refuse of the people—by a Greek compendium, which contracted the twenty-eight books of the original into twenty.[1] The third version, in still briefer form, was made for the use of that King Dejotarus whom Cicero mentions[2] as a most diligent farmer and breeder of cattle, and shows that even in the long-civilised Asia Minor the Punic prescriptions were valued.

But quite apart from this fruitless theoretical measure to reform and improve the farming of the ever-increasing Roman domains was the practical imitation of the Punic habit of growing great tracts of wheat with the aid of slave labour. In the climate of North Africa nothing paid a higher interest; but, in days when machinery was unknown, the cultivation of wheat required many hands, and, therefore, capital with a command of many slaves. This was the enterprise which the Romans sought to transfer to Sicily, where the land and climate permitted some hope of rivalling the waving crops of Africa. The capture of Carthage, like all such conquests in ancient days, threw an enormous number of slaves into the market, or rather there was an immense market of them immediately after the storming of the place. Not only all the slaves of the Carthaginians, but the masters themselves, were bought in gangs by Roman and Sicilian speculators, and carried off to till the plains of Sicily. Thus the great slave population of Carthage, mostly kidnapped or cap-

---

[1] See the arguments for this theory in my article, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[2] *Pro rege Deiot.*, 27: *diligentissimus agricola et pecuarius.*

(103–99 B. C.), it may be well to treat it in connection with the first, so far as it serves to illustrate how the Greek elements were being absorbed into the Roman world. After the struggle with Jugurtha had shown how corrupt the Roman oligarchy had already become, there surpervened the desperate crisis of the Cimbric invasion. When several Roman hosts had been swallowed up by the flood of the advancing hordes, just as the splendid army of Bajazet disappeared before the wave of the Tartars, the Senate sent to ask for auxiliaries from the Hellenistic kings in alliance, as it was called, with Rome. Nicomedes of Bithynia replied that he had no men left to send, seeing that the body of his population had been sold into slavery to satisfy the extortions of the Roman tax-gatherers.[1] The reply was probably exaggerated, since it was so admirable an opportunity of making a protest against the terrible oppression of the *publicani;* but it awoke the Senate to the injustice and the danger of such a policy, and they set about correcting it by a new and still more obvious blunder. An order was issued forbidding any free citizen of an allied state to be kept in bondage for such debts; and this order, which seems to have been issued for Sicily, the province whither all these eastern slaves were, as a matter of course, drafted, was the occasion of the outbreak.

Crowds of slaves had come in and claimed their liberty, so much so that the terrified owners hurried to the Roman prætor, and persuaded him to suspend the order. No doubt the danger was great; it was not likely that these long-oppressed and degraded strangers would make any good use of their liberty. But the mischief was done. Finding their one hope of liberty at the hands of the Roman Senate balked, these unfortunate creatures were driven by fury and despair into another dreadful insurrection. There were, of course, many horrors—awful revenge taken upon cruel masters in their isolated villas, wholesale crucifixions of prisoners as criminals, and, after a hard struggle, a riveting of the old bonds upon the wretched remnant left from the ravages of fire and sword.

---

[1] The history of this affair and of the Second Slave War is in the excerpts from Diodorus, lib. xxxvi, by Photius.

In this war, too, we find that the names of the leaders[1] point to Hellenistic origin, and that the body of the slaves were of that kind, though it is to be noted that the style assumed by the leader Tryphon is not Syrian, but Roman, and that he has a senate and lictors instead of peers and a royal household.[2] But the use of miracle and prophecy is there; there is a strange expectation of some coming Saviour, who shall redeem the poor and the afflicted from their tormentors; there is a combination of the free poor with the slaves; all of which symptoms indicate a widespread feeling that injustice and oppression had attained the extreme when the world's Providence must bring some relief. And this, as I pointed out, is the common feature of the Second Slave War with the war of Aristonicus, the illegitimate representative of the Attalids, who called his nation to arms when the will of Attalus III "left Pergamum" to the Roman people. We now know from an inscription that the will was genuine, but also that, as the king had no right to bequeath the state, he probably bequeathed only his private estate.[1] The coast cities and the dynasts opposed Aristonicus vigourously; the slaves and the poor people in the interior supported him; and he dreamed of founding a new City of the Sun, in which his Heliopolitans would escape the oppressions of the new and terrible masters of the Hellenistic world.[2]

---

[1] At least of Athenio. But the other, Salvius, assumed a Syrian royal name, Tryphon. Cf. *Hermathena*, Vol. VII (1890), p. 175.

[2] This appears from Diodorus, xxxvi, 1 *sub fin.*

There were also outbreaks in Italy, but neither important nor, so far as we know, Hellenistic in character. The shepherds and neatherds of the Italian pastures were sparse and rude, unable to plan and carry out a dangerous revolt. The only droves of slaves who could thus combine did in due course of time combine, and produce a desperate war. They were the gladiators under Spartacus. But though joined by a good many shepherds, their numbers were never very great; they won battles by the high training of their bloody profession, and it is clear that this class was least of all recruited among the Greek-speaking population, which had neither the muscle nor the physical courage of the Thracian or the Spanish mountaineers.[3]

These wild and hopeless contests are, however, the earliest protests against the republican conquest of the world, and indicate that here lie the forces which will class Englishman now holds, who knows no foreign tongue, respects no foreign habit, recognises no foreign virtue, but walks through the world assuming his English respectability, just as the Roman assumed his *gravitas*, to be the exclusive property of his superior race.

---

[1] Cf. my article in *Hermathena*, Vol. IX (1896).

[2] Cf. the details in my article, Vol. VII, pp. 181 *sq.*

[3] The same causes which produced these wars also produced the prevalence of highway robbery in the wilds of Italy and Greece, and still more the extraordinary prevalence of piracy, upon which we shall have much to say in the succeeding chapters.

Hellenism, under the immediate grip of Rome, in Sicily, in Pergamum, found at once that anything was better than submission—hence the Slave Wars and the war of Aristonicus. The states in looser dependence were not so unfortunate, and were able to tolerate their servitude somewhat longer; yet even they, when they found a leader, as in Mithradates, or an escape into the high seas, took up arms eagerly against their new masters.

Such, then, was the miserable state of Hellenism, from which a gradual reaction, together with the dissensions of the Romans, produced only a slow and partial recovery.

A little more than a century elapsed from the destruction of Corinth to the establishment of the Empire. There is probably no epoch of ancient history for which we have more ample and curious materials; yet they are all concerned with the Roman side of the world, and mention Greeks and Asiatics only in relation to their conquerors. Agitated also and eventful as these years were, we cannot say that any great new principle of government was discovered, or any but material advantages gained for the world. It was perfectly manifest 140 years before Christ that the Romans would remain masters of the Mediterranean countries, so far as force could keep them so. The only chance of escape from their sway must arise from their internal dissension, and it very soon appeared that no internal dissension was likely to produce a separation

his inevitable cycle in the life of
ps of all - states. The first man who overth
and made himself master of Rome was an
l an oligarch, Sulla. He undertook to restc
iination of the Senate, and turn back the cou
one hundred years. He massacred or outlaw
onents; no scruples restrained him; he was
ıre examples in history of an unselfish despot
way his enemies for a principle, and who res
order of things in the interest of the aristo
han his own. When his work was done, he
l, and was able to comtemplate the victory c
tical ideas.

one of the most instructive lessons in all his
s restored aristocracy, this realisation of the wi
dreams, fell to pieces in a few years, in spi
ıthor's safeguards and protections, in spite of
of all his adversaries, in spite also of the
great genius started up at once to destroy it.
onstitution fell to pieces of itself, because it
the spirit of the

some relief from the systematic rapacity and injustice of the nobles, whom he would subdue and keep in check. On this point Greek experience was very ample. For centuries, the masses in Greek polities had saved themselves from oligarchical oppression by adopting a tyrant to subdue it.

The political side of this period of Hellenism (up to the establishment of Cæsar's monarchy) must, therefore, have been unutterably sad and dreary. The only alternative the subject states saw before them was whether a Licinius or a Cornelius was to plunder them, not to speak of the occasions when a civil war among the possessors of the world imposed upon the wretched provinces requisitions from both sides. Thus the Hellenic peninsula was made the theatre of three vast and devastating conflicts, two of which were civil wars among Romans, in which Greece had no concern.

Far more interesting to the historian than the actual provinces, with their uniformity of mismanagement under Roman prætors, and their small contrasts of so-called free cities and actual subjects, are the outlying fragments of Hellenism which had not yet fallen under Rome at the close of the century before us, and were only gradually absorbed by the conquests of Lucullus and Pompey, or by the rise of the Parthian power. Egypt lasted even longer. I say fragments of Hellenism, because not only were the Hellenistic empires either shattered or decayed, but there had been growing for some time a distinct reaction of Asiatic or African nationalities against the adventitious culture imported by the conquests of Alexander.

The enormous area then to be civilised, and the indelible type of old Greek culture, made it necessary that the *form* of spreading Hellenism should be by planting cities (strictly speaking, city-polities) in the midst of the foreign populations—cities more or less densely or sparsely sown over a large area,[1] but always separate *loci* of Greek culture, surrounded by a rural population excluded from the city privileges, or at least possessing none of their own.[2] In Syria, for example, these cities were very numerous, in Egypt very few, and so in India and the far East. But everywhere beyond the immediate coasts of the Ægean they were marked by their language, which remained foreign to the country people, and which, though learned by vast numbers of Semites, never became the native tongue or vernacular of any tract of country not long since peopled by Hellenes. Subsequently, the Arab conquest of the East, like the Roman of the West, imposed not only its culture, but its language, upon the vanquished; it is plain, then, that Hellenism did not lay the same hold as these two laid upon the nations which it subdued and occupied.

[1] Droysen (*Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Vol. III, Appendix) has given a list of these cities, which is very long indeed. Strabo, xi, 9. 1, mentions Apamea and Heracleia close to Rhagæ, Alexandria, and Achaia in Arachosia.

[2] The country people lived κωμηδόν, in contrast to the city, which was technically called πόλις οἰκουμένη, a *constituted city*, e. g. by Xenophon (*Anabasis*, i, 2) several times, and Strabo says (iii, 4–13), ἄγριοι γὰρ οἱ κατὰ κώμας οἰκοῦντες. To reduce the population to village life was to destroy the city, ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν τὴν πόλιν, or ἀοίκητον, which does not imply the massacre of the population any more than the Roman *capitis diminutio* implies execution. It is characteristic of this form of civilisation that Cicero tells us the distinctive inferiority and barbarism of Sardinia were shown by its not possessing a single *free city* (*pro Scauro*, 44), for this is what he means by *amica populi Romani et libera civitas*.

national leaders, who brought back the national religion and language as symbols of their patriotism, in Parthia and India; it is shown also in the gradual estrangement of the provinces left under indigenous princes, such as Cappadocia and Armenia; in the growing importance of Arab chiefs, such as Aretas and Sampsiceramus; it is further shown by the many obstinate insurrections in Egypt, the revival of old Egyptian cults, the disappearance of Greeks from court, and the substitution of Jews as the advisers of the Ptolemies; we may perhaps see an echo of this great oriental reaction in the *character* of the Slave Wars just described—I mean the prominence of Syrian wonder-working and Syrian religion even in the Greek-speaking slave population of Sicily.[1] This is the great field over which we must range to find the action and reaction of the Greek spirit upon the other nationalities of the ancient world.

[1] Cf. on these points B. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 480.

and Persian provinces. We do not know whether Seleucus found his adversary too strong to attack, or whether he was actually defeated in battle, or whether (what I think most likely) he found the complications of the West, and the threatening power of Antigonus and his son Demetrius, so urgent a danger that he was ready to conclude his Indian campaign upon easy terms. Certain it is that he not only made peace and a marriage alliance with Sandracottus, but ceded to him the lands immediately west of the Indus, so making the Hindukush and the great Persian desert the new boundaries which separated the Hellenistic world from the farther East. But Sandracottus, on the other hand, seems to have paid him for the provinces, not only with treasure, but with those 500 elephants which turned the scale at Ipsus,[1] and made Seleucus master of the world.

Sandracottus' friendly relations, moreover, with Seleucus were maintained, and so it was that a Greek envoy, Megasthenes, was sent to the Indian court at Palimbothra, the Indian Pataliputra, a great city on the Ganges near the site of the present Patna. It was from the work composed by Megasthenes, his *Indica*, that the Hellenistic world first obtained a distinct account of the wealth and wonders of this land of fable. Not that Megasthenes, any more than Marco Polo or Sir John Mandeville, escaped the snare of credulousness as to monstrous animals and strange phenomena. But, in spite of this, the large extracts quoted in Strabo's geography, which are worked together into an able sketch in Lassen's great work,[2] show together with Sogdiana, which Alexander had found so difficult to subdue, and where he had established many Greek cities as outposts for protection and for trade. Diodotus, the satrap of that country, declared himself an independent sovran.

---

[1] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 37.

[2] *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. II, and recently in Mr. Vincent Smith's masterly *Early History of India* (1904).

The reader must not take his notions of Bactria from modern maps, which represent Balkh and Samarcand as lying on the border of the steppes, a land of sand and of barrenness, hardly fit for nomad shepherds. Bactria was, and indeed still is, a province of great natural wealth, once fertile in all the produce, except olives, valued by civilised men—cattle, corn, and wine—and, moreover, the natural centre-point in which the caravans from China and from India met on their way by the Caspian and Caucasus into Europe. When Darius was defeated, it was the satrap of this province, then Spitamenes of Sogdiana, who took the lead, and the country possessed a wealthy aristocracy dwelling in strong castles, and going out to war with their retainers—an aristocracy proud enough to furnish a suitable queen to the great conqueror himself. Here then, somewhere about 250 B. C., Diodotus established himself as king of Bactria.[1] His example was presently followed by the satrap of Areia, the next province to the south, and indeed by other satraps, whose exact dominions within Bactria, Sogdiana, and Areia we cannot distinguish.

It seems quite certain that the great synod of Buddhists which Açoka held in the thirteenth year of his reign, and in which the doctrines of the faith were revived and purified, took place before the revolt of these provinces from nurtured a strong national Indian feeling, which could resist all encroachment of foreign fashions. This, I think, accounts for the fact that, though all the extant remains of antiquity in northwestern India begin with Açoka—there is nothing earlier known—and though we have from his day various monuments, there is no trace of Hellenistic influence after that date.

---

[1] Strabo, whose account of these things is very confused, says it was Euthydemus, which is certainly wrong.

The rise of Diodotus in Bactria was followed by the revolt of Arsaces in Parthia (to the west of Bactria), and the establishment of that kingdom, afterwards so famous, as a distinct protest of the native population against the Macedonian sway. The Arsacids were for a long time weaker than their Bactrian neighbours. The Parthian was hardly able to withstand Seleucus Callinicus,[1] and fled away when Antiochus the Great made his victorious campaign into the East.[2] The Bactrian house of Diodotus had been already displaced by another line, for the opponent whom Antiochus found there, with whom he made peace and a treaty, was Euthydemus, whose kingdom seems to have spread from Areia northward into Bactria. Presently the Parthians grew stronger and seized most of Bactria, so making a great barrier between the eastern and western Hellenism of Asia. But the new Greek kingdom extended itself to the South and East. After the death of Açoka and his son, their great kingdom began to decay, and Strabo tells us that the Indo-Greek King Menander owned one thousand cities in India. "So popular," says Plutarch,[3] "was this king that, when during a campaign he died in his camp, his obsequies perception of the nature of evidence. Thus when Lassen argues, as he often does, that a certain king must have reigned a short time, because his now extant coins are very few, he surely argues from what may be the mere accident of non-discovery as if it were a positive fact. It seems to me also that the beautiful coinage of these kings has been too readily taken as evidence of general Hellenistic culture in their dominions.[1] It *may* have been an almost isolated Hellenistic feature. We know that the Arsacids for a long time to come had their coinage struck by the Greek cities which they tolerated as Hellenistic islands in their thoroughly oriental constitution. Seleucia on the Tigris, for example, which entitles one of them Philhellene on account of his favours, was no specimen of the rest of Parthia, nor could these kings have laid claim to much else than their coinage as a proof that they were influenced by Alexander's conquests.

---

[1] Strabo, xi, 8. 8.

[2] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 398.

[3] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 28.

Had we no further evidence than coins, the case of Euthydemus and Eucratides might not be much stronger. But the summary of Justin, and of Strabo from Apollodorus of Artemita, in addition to the numerous coins just mentioned, and the distinct traces of Hellenistic influence in architectural remains throughout the Punjab, make the existence of some slight Græco-Indian culture indisputable.

According to the English antiquaries, who have spent years in studying these remains, Alexander's conquest produced a perfect revolution in Indian architecture; for till that day the people on the Indus and the Ganges had not known the use of stone in building! This theory seems to me to have been established on the authority of the architect Fergusson, who maintained it not only in his general *History*, but in a special work on Indian building. It is the sudden appearance of stone pillars carved with Açoka's inscriptions in many parts of India, together with the total absence of any earlier dated building or carving in stone, which has determined Fergusson and his school. On the other hand, Rajendralala Mitra,[1] in contesting this view, has asserted the far greater antiquity of some of the cave-dwellings, in which the natural features are much modified both by cutting and by ornament, and has urged the great improbability that any old and advanced culture, such as that of India, should exist without this obvious discovery.[2]

---

[1] The history of these Greeks and the Arsacid reaction is only sketched in Strabo, xi, 9, and in Justin, neither of whom is in this instance well informed or trustworthy. I am glad to find myself supported on perfectly independent grounds by Mr. Vincent Smith.

The author also extracts from early Indian books, such as the Mâhabhârata, allusions to stone-building and sculpture. But whether this epic is from the sixth century B. C., and not posterior to Açoka, is a matter of dispute. It is, indeed, true that the early stone buildings found and described by Fergusson showed clear imitations of wooden structure, such as we might expect from the earliest attempts in stone; but Rajendralala shows that quite recent buildings in Mohammedan times, even down to our fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, show the same close imitation of woodwork, so that this feature is no proof, in India, of the novelty of the art. So likewise the Greek temple is clearly an imitation of early wooden building, yet how far back it reaches!

[1] In his work on the antiquities of Orissa.

[2] This argument is not worth much in the face of the absence of coinage — a very obvious discovery—from Egypt till Ptolemaic times.

Let me add that the argument from the absence of evidence is very weak when applied to a far-gone time, for we can show astonishing gaps of tradition in even recent centuries; and there are nations which consider the destruction of earlier work not only natural, but even a proper assertion of a new faith and a new civilisation. The spreading of Buddhism by Açoka was no doubt a great epoch in Indian history, and the multiplication of his stone records quite a novelty; but to postulate that this ready and apparently familiar use of a very hard material was a foreign importation seems hardly reasonable.

The advocates on either side seem not to have thought of examining the evidence of Megasthenes, where both might have found curious support. For, in the first place, his statement that the walls of Palimbothra were made of wood, with apertures for shooting at the enemy,[1] seems to imply that stone walls were not used. But the valley of the Ganges about Patna is very devoid of stone, and it is quite possible that the floods of the river, which seem to have carried away every trace of this ancient capital, made it desirable to have some light and pervious, or even removable, fortification.

On the other hand, Megasthenes notes[2] the *philotechnia* or mechanical talent of the race in imitating what they found novel among the invading Macedonians—how they manufactured imitation sponges, and adopted the strigil and oil-flask of the Greeks. Is it likely that when mentioning such facts he would have omitted noticing the adoption of so all-important a novelty as the use of stonesculptural types are the lessons to be learned from the use of Greek forms in the bases and capitals of pillars. Unfortunately, the extant specimens are not very early; they belong, not to the first days of Hellenism, but to the epoch treated in the present volume, their dates ranging from about 40 B. C. to 100 A. D.; that is to say, after the splendours of Menander and Eucratides were gone by, and the national reaction was reducing everything to its oriental level. We have, however, specimens of Greek capitals during this epoch, which Cunningham classifies[1] as Indo-Doric (in Kashmir), Indo-Ionic (at Taxila), Indo-Corinthian (in the Kabul valley). Of these the first is represented by some specimens so late and so barbarous as to have little weight in the discussion. The very simple form of the Doric pillar and capital is easily developed from the mere practical conditions of making a stone support, and as I do not think the well-known examples at Beni-Hassan (in Egypt) of such primitive pillars prove any connection with the Greek Doric, so I think in these examples from Kashmir that the resemblances may be merely accidental.[2]

---

[1] ξύλινον περίβολον ἔχουσαν. Megasthenes in Strabo, xv, 1. 36.

[2] Strabo, xv, 1. 67.

It is not so with the Ionic capital discovered at Taxila (Shah-dheri, north of Lahore), and now preserved in the Museum of Lahore. This no doubt belongs to the temple described in the very mendacious life of Apollonius of Tyana as being of great size with a complete peristyle, but having the walls covered with metal reliefs in gold, silver, orichalcum, bronze, and iron, representing the wars of Alexander with Porus.[1] But if the temple had, indeed, been a rich Hellenistic temple covered with ornament, how can we account for the extremely simple and archaic character of the capital in question, which might, indeed, be fairly used to prove that the Ionic order originated in the far East, and was derived by the Ionians from oriental models? I can only argue from the careful description and illustration of this temple by Cunningham,[2] for neither a photograph nor any illustrated catalogue of the objects in the museum at Lahore is to be obtained in Europe. What is still more puzzling concerning this temple is its late date, for under the foundation was discovered a formal deposit of coins of King Azas, dating from about 80 B. C. So then these apparently Hellenistic influences were surviving long after the acknowledged decay of all Greek domination in the East.[3]

---

[1] Cf. *Archæological Survey*, Vol. III, Preface, p. v; Vol. V, pp. 69, 85, and Appendix A, with the plates of illustration—a most interesting collection of materials.

[2] The example given in the plates at the end of the volume which I am now citing is indeed very suggestive of a Greek origin, especially in its fluting, with sharp arrises. The capital is considerably modified, but, on the whole, some far-off echo of Greek style is probable.

This is eminently the case with the beautiful specimens of Corinthian pillars and pilasters given in the same volume.[4] These, while showing a masterly application of the acanthus-leaf ornament, introduce figures in the capital—a perfectly free and original treatment of the feature derived from Greek architecture.[5] But these also date from the first century, and may possibly have been the work of artists who had visited the Græco-Roman world.

---

[1] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, ii, 20.

[2] *Archæological Survey*, Vol. V, pp. 69 *sq*.

[3] Mr. V. Smith (*History*, p. 212) thinks that these instances are later borrowings from Græco-Roman art, and not due directly to Greek traditions in India.

[4] Cf. *op. cit.*, Appendix A.

[5] These highly ornamental pillars, with their very wide-spreading capitals, seem to have stood alone, with a figure or figures set up upon them. This, too, is a Greek, or a Græco-Roman, fashion.

We are told by the geographers that in far later days the old Indo-Greek coins were still current in commerce with nations at the mouth of the Indus,[1] and Strabo preserves for us (xv, 1) from Nicolaus Damascenus (a very respectable authority) the following remarkable proof of the persistence even of the Greek language as the organ of diplomacy up to the Christian era. He said that at Antioch he had met with the Indian ambassadors who had been sent to Cæsar Augustus. Most of them had been killed or disabled by the length of the journey; three only had reached Antioch, with a missive written in Greek on a leather skin (parchment) containing polite messages from Porus (as the Indian king was entitled) with sundry presents, among which was a creature called Hermas, from his resemblance to the pillars of that name, his arms having been taken off at the shoulder. This person Strabo himself saw at Rome.

Thus, then, as regards material civilisation, the Greeks had done not a little in the far East. They had founded kingdoms, built cities, coined money, dedicated temples, and showed to the natives of the Indus and upper Ganges a culture widely different from that of the eastern Aryans. But the genius of these nations was too different in kind from that of Europe for any permanent assimilation. Superficial imitations were possible, and they were many;

---

[1] The author of the *Periplus* (probably in the second century A. D.) says: *ἀφ' οὗ μέχρι νῦν ἐν Βαρυγάζοις παλαιαὶ προχωροῦσι δραχμαὶ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐγκεχαραγμέναι ἐπίσημα τῶν μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον βεβασιλευκότων Ἀπολλοδότου καὶ Μενάνδρου.*

we cannot point to a single spiritual legacy left by the successors of Alexander to these remote conquests, unless it be the drama. And here we come upon a most interesting, but a very difficult, literary problem.

The principal plays in Indian literature have been translated by the late Professor H. H. Wilson,[1] with a very instructive preface upon the rules and precedents of this peculiar drama. Their *Poetics* had been elaborated with the usual love of intricacy shown by oriental scholars, so that there is a luxury of directions quite grotesque to the European reader. Thus the types of the chief character, according to the emotions he is to portray, are divided and subdivided till they reach 144 varieties![2] Tragedy and comedy are not very clearly distinguished, as a happy ending is prescribed, even to the most serious pieces, so that the modern melodrama is our nearest parallel. Indeed, as Wilson has shown clearly enough,[3] there are analogies to be found both to the Greek, the French, and the English stage, and he very naturally ascribes these to the uniformity of the conditions required by any drama, and the certainty that all civilised men will endeavour to solve similar problems by similar devices. The wide divergencies, therefore, of the Indian drama from the Greek, in many details, combined with its close resemblances to the modern European plays which owe least to classic sources, have persuaded Wilson that he has before him a perfectly original and independent development. Christian Lassen also, a far higher authority, pointing to the fact that the habit of attending plays is implied in the oldest Buddhistic writings, evidently attributes the origin of the Indian drama to an age prior to all Hellenistic influences, which he formally rejects.[1] He considers it to have arisen out of dances and songs to the gods, quite in the manner of the Greek drama.

---

[1] *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, 2 vols., 2d ed. (London, 1835).

[2] *Op. cit.*, Introduction, p. lxiv.

[3] *Op. cit.*, Preface.

I know not how much either author may have known of the Hellenistic drama and its diffusion through the East; how much either may have underrated the importance and long persistence of Indo-Greek culture in the kingdoms of Euthydemus and Eucratides. But to us, who have recovered many more traces of the culture than were known in Wilson's day, the filiation of these plays from Greek patterns will appear almost certain.

We have, indeed, a gap between the decay of Greek civilisation in the second century and the composition of the extant Indian plays, which may not be of earlier date than what we should call the Middle Ages. The particular examples which Wilson cites, though he evidently believes their antiquity exaggerated, do not profess to be older than the first century B. C., and very few even of that age. It is much more likely that none of them arose till the habit of hearing Greek plays had died out, which could hardly have been the case till the second century A. D.[2] But the majority are probably far more recent. While this long interval makes it quite reasonable to expect wide variations and new developments from any

---

[1] *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. II, p. 507.

[2] This is the date assigned to the oldest of them, the *Mrikkatika*, by Lassen, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 512.

Greek original, we must note, on the other hand, that the whole tone of the Indian drama is archaic; the language of the principal characters being Sanskrit, the speaking of which was long since extinct among men; the language even of the inferior parts being a Prakrit or vulgar dialect far removed from ordinary life, and highly artificial.[1] Thus these plays can never have been easily understood, and they required much commentary, which was added by way of prologue to the performance, even for those grandees and their households before whom they were produced.

This use of a non-vernacular language points either to an origin of vast antiquity, which no Indian scholar ever suggests, or else—and I think very distinctly—to the copying of those Greek plays which had long been produced at the Indian courts by strolling companies of Dionysiac players for the amusement of princes, who were, or posed as, Greeks, while the majority of their retinue must have found the dialogue quite incomprehensible. In the well-known case of Euripides' *Bacchæ*, acted at the Parthian court, when the head of Crassus was brought in, we have an example of the model which native poets would emulate. It was the fashion to hear plays in a foreign language, and a time came when that language was an archaic foreign language, which those of the former generation had understood better than those of to-day. There were no Greek theatres built in India, but an extempore stage was constructed in the court of a palace by these strolling companies. At the same time, they were not like the strolling players of modern times, often mountebanks or paupers, trying to earn a miserable livelihood, and treated with contempt, but guilds in the service of Dionysus, of much wealth and importance, and a necessary adjunct to every Hellenistic feast, or founding of a city. All these features are carefully reproduced in the Indian drama,[1] and what could be more natural than to compose plays in a purely literary form of Indian speech, when the habit of hearing Greek plays died out for want of either players to act them or princes to patronise them? The number of extant Indian plays is only about sixty, and no author is credited with more than three—another evidence that this drama is neither very old nor really national. It appears to me nothing more than an attempt to keep alive a foreign drama by means of indigenous talent, successful to a certain extent, and giving rise to much theory and commentary, as might be expected in a very subtle metaphysical society of scholars, but in reality the last echo of the Hellenistic kingdoms, which once had promised to subdue the regions of the East to western language and western civilisation.

---

[1] Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. lxiii *sq.*

---

[1] "Companies of actors in India must have been common at an early date [Wilson appears to know nothing of the Greek strolling companies], and must have been reputable, for the 'inductions' often refer to the poets as their personal friends, and a poet of tolerable merit in India, under the ancient *régime*, was the friend and associate of sages and kings.

"The Hindu actors were apparently never classed with vagabonds or menials. . . . . As to theatrical edifices, the manners of the people and the nature of the climate were adverse to their existence, and the spacious open courts of the dwellings of persons of consequence were adapted to the purposes of dramatic representation. We should never forget that the Hindu drama was not exhibited by an ordinary occurrence, or an amusement of the people, but that it was part of an occasional celebration of some solemn or religious festival." (Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. lxvi.) One might use these very words to describe the performances of the Hellenistic Dionysiac troupes in the East.

This view of the question has been adopted by eminent recent Indianists, Weber, Brandes, and Windisch, the last of whom has given an excellent summary of the arguments in a special tract.[1] These scholars do not, indeed, maintain that the Indian drama owes its *origin* to the Greek, but rather that some rude mimic representations of earlier days were transformed by Hellenistic contact into the sort of play now extant. It appears that the worship of Çiva was near enough in character to that of Dionysus to suggest a transference, and that the Indian plays were produced at the spring feasts of that Indian god. Windisch has gone *seriatim* through the characters of the Greek drama, and has shown that in the earliest extant Indian play, which he takes to be the *Toy-Cart* (translated in Wilson's first volume), the stock figures of the new Attic comedy, reproduced in the Roman comedy, are distinctly to be traced. He notes that the whole idea of representing ordinary life, with courtesans, parasites, etc., is so opposed to what we know of old Indian literature as to point strongly to a foreign influence. The number and arrangement of the actors, the disposition of acts and scenes, are all analogous to those in Plautus and Terence, though not without many changes required by Indian life and habits. It can surely be no accident that the curtain which concealed the green room behind the scene, and so formed the background, is called *yavanikâ*, the Greek curtain. In the *Toy-Cart* the raising of the virtuous courtesan to a rank of respectability by her marriage in the end of the play, is a feature foreign to old Indian life.[2]

---

[1] *Der griechische Einfluss im indischen Drama* (Berlin, 1882).

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 30. Mr. V. Smith agrees with Windisch (*History*, p. 212).

The device of recognition by toys or amulets is also Greek. I must refer the reader for many further details to the tract in question.

The author shows with great ability that the later specimens of this drama drift away from the Greek traditions, and become more and more purely Indian, even in their religion. The special worship of Çiva is replaced by that of Vishnu. But, I think, he does not appreciate the very great importance of the manager or impresario (who was often the leading actor) in a company of *strolling* players, who had to carry with them, or find, their "properties," and construct their own stage for each performance. This is the meaning of the manager in Indian drama being called by a name which also means "architect;" this is the cause of the importance of the prologue. The religious address or prayer (Nândî) seems to have been spoken by a special personage, perhaps no Greek layman.

This drama, then, the beautiful Corinthian decorations of some temples, and the adoption of Greek ornament in Indian building, together with the wealth of Hellenistic coins, are the total result now remaining of the influences of Greek culture upon the far East.[1] It does not seem necessary to refer these effects to the pre-Roman period of this influence, for neither the date of the greatest diffusion, nor the character of what remains, points to anything distinct from that Hellenism which pervaded the

---

[1] Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, Vol. II, p. 359, though he elsewhere admits some influences in architecture, sums up the whole Greek influence upon Bactria and India as amounting merely to a revolution in the art of coining; all the rest is not provable, or was merely transitory. I have said nothing of Hindu astronomy, but learn from experts that this, too, shows traces of Greek influence.

Roman East. It is therefore not improbable that Roman power and Roman influence had something to say to the respect with which these things were adopted and copied by people of purely oriental origin.

The brilliancy and gradual decay into barbarism of the Greek kingdoms of Bactria and of India are similar, on a large scale, to the history of those isolated settlements about the Crimea and the Sea of Asov, which we shall meet in the wars of Mithradates and in the travels of Dion Chrysostom. Here, too, we shall find old Greek colonies separated from their mother-cities, maintaining themselves with marvellous vigour, and preserving an affecting attachment to the traditions and memories of their long-lost Hellas. But here, too, we cannot but see that the force of surrounding barbarism was too much for them; the constant struggle for existence led to weariness, to concessions which contaminated their purity and dissipated their energy; and so, without any Mithradates, and without any Romans, these outlying cities, like Posidonia in the land of the Samnites, would have been ultimately "barbarised out and out."[1] It was the greatest of Rome's missions to protect Hellenism from this fate, even where this mission was performed with contempt, with injustice, and with the oppression of those whom she professed to make free and independent.

[1] Cf. p. 245, note, for Strabo's general statement.

CHAPTER III

HELLENISM IN UPPER EGYPT

Our knowledge of the history of remote Hellenism, unaffected by the Roman conquest of the world for some generations, is now no longer confined to the vague and occasional notices of Greek kingdoms in inner Asia or on the Sea of Asov. The brilliant discoveries of recent years have disclosed to us the life and doings of a large settlement of Greeks under the sway of the Ptolemies, in Upper Egypt, where they were, indeed, protected and favoured by the crown, but subject to the continuous influence of a large, long-civilised native population of a peculiarly tough and enduring type. In the end this pressure was successful. The phenomenon we can witness in Upper Egypt is the very gradual waning of the Greek, and waxing of the indigenous, elements. As soon as the Alexandrian power declined, and the Greeks were no longer supported or even favoured by the monarchy, this change becomes clearly visible. But for centuries the Greeks, or rather the forces of Hellenism, maintained themselves with no small success, even in this remote and foreign land.

It is desirable to review the earlier history of this isolated province of Hellenism, though it belongs to a period prior to the Roman conquest, and, like the Bactrian and Indian kingdoms, was the direct creation of Alexander's immediate successors. But to understand inner

Egypt under the Romans would be impossible without some knowledge of Egypt under the Greeks, as the Ptolemies and their mixed population of invaders loved to call themselves; and seeing that the knowledge of this Greek Egypt is too new to be accessible in any but special and often cumbrous works, the reader will not resent going back with me to the moment of the plantation of Hellenism in the kingdom of the Pharaohs. This plantation is a thing quite distinct from the founding of Alexandria, which I have accordingly discussed in another connection.[1] What I now approach is the settlement of Macedonians and Greeks, accompanied by Persians and Jews, in the secluded and mysterious land of Upper Egypt.

The first Ptolemy is known to have founded one, and only one, "city of the Greek fashion" in the remote country. This was Ptolemais, of which the site is now known as Menshieh, about four hundred miles up the river from Alexandria. We have found inscriptions enough to tell us that it had the usual machinery of a Greek city, even to performances by Dionysiac artists, and games after the Hellenic model. There have also been a few important literary texts on papyrus unearthed in the neighhourhood, though the cemetery of the old city is as yet undiscovered, and a town is built over the site, so that the conditions for modern research are there unfavourable. But from the Serapeum of Memphis there have come to the museums of Europe a great group of texts telling us of the life and doings of Greeks and Egyptians in connection with that sanctuary, and these—long since published in the stately volumes of the Louvre, the British Museum, and the learned reports of scholars in Leyden, Turin, and Rome—showed us something of the fusion of the nations and invaders which had already taken place in the days of the seventh Ptolemy (*circa* 150 B. C.).

---

[1] P. 236.

But their materials are as nothing compared with discoveries made within the last twenty years—at Oxyrynchus and in the Fayyum, a deep oasis in the Libyan desert not far from the Nile at Wasta, of which Herodotus and after him Strabo told many strauge things. The wonders of the lake Mœris, of the labyrinth and the pyramids, and still more of the irrigation of the high rim of this deep depression by an arm of the Nile, taken off the river eighty miles farther up—these archæological and geographical matters may be studied in Major Brown's Monograph *Lake Mœris*, or in Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt's *Fayyum Towns and Their Papyri.*

The discovery by Mr. Flinders Petrie of a Ptolemaic cemetery at Gurob, near the present entrance into this oasis from the Nile (by rail from Wasta), in which a certain number of the coffins were made up, not of wood, but of layers of waste papers, coated within and without with clay and painting, gave us the key to this new island of Hellenism. The tattered rags of papyrus which made up these coffins contained not only precious fragments of Greek literature, but numerous private documents—contracts, petitions, ordinances, accounts, and wills—which proved that in the days of the second Ptolemy (*ca.* 265 B. C.) there was a large settlement of Macedonians and Greeks, with their companions in arms from Persia and Palestine, made in the Fayyum, round about the chief city, then Crocodilopolis, and the villages on the slopes descending to the lake. It was a soldiers' colony, endowed with lands, and richly, for many of them were granted one hundred Egyptian acres; and in Egypt, if there be sufficient irrigation, such a farm produces an enormous crop. I had thought, when I first deciphered and published these papers,[1] that a large number of natives must have been dispossessed to make room for the colony, but further researches have shown that a wiser expedient was adopted. The lake, then much higher than it now is, covered large tracts of land with very shallow water, and an intelligent system of dykes was able to reclaim many thousand submerged acres. The fish of the lake, which are in myriads, being the appanage of the queen, it was probably her cession of part of this domain, and her building of the great *Arsinoe's Dyke* often mentioned in these papers, which caused the whole province, then called *the Lake*, to be renamed the Arsinoite Nome. Crocodilopolis remained the chief town, but the important spot where the Nile water entered, and in flood-time left, the Fayyum, and from which the irrigation of the whole province was controlled, was called *Ptolemais of the Harbour*, where many canal-boats discharged their freight; and on the slopes on three sides of the lake—the west slope was mostly steep and rocky, leading into the great desert—many small towns with Greek names—Theadelphia, Philadelphia, Philoteris, Bacchias, etc.—were built, showing not only their Greek, but their Ptolemaic, origin.

If these were built on the reclaimed land, there was no older native town on the site, and therefore their plans, several of which have been explored by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, are exceedingly interesting as showing us what a Hellenistic foundation in a strange land intended to accomplish. The leading feature in each was a temple, which was apparently the only stone building among mud-brick houses, and which dominated the village much in the same way that the parish church does in England. There was a wide approach, either from the lake or from the village, to this temple, and we can imagine it set about with trees. But it was not dedicated to any Greek god, but to the local divinity of the place, Suchus, Premarres, etc., generally some modification of the crocodile god of the Fayyum. This recognition from the outset of an Egyptian god in a Greek settlement is surely a most significant fact. We know from Tebtunis papyri that there were even then[1] shrines devoted to Zeus, Aphrodite, and other Greek gods, but in no case was the principal temple so dedicated. There was, however, a convenient plan of associating with the lord of the temple *co-templar gods* (*σύνναοι θεοί*), which enabled the settlers to find a home for their imported creed. We know that other Egyptian gods, particularly Isis, were so brought in, but the whole impression produced is that the Græco-Macedonian settlers were not a very devout society, and that the king rather considered the religion of the surrounding nations than that of his Greek subjects.

---

[1] *Cunningham Memoirs*, Vols. VII and VIII, published by the Royal Irish Academy, 1891–93.

For we cannot conceive the hundred-acre men, many of them soldiers of the Guard, doing their own tillage, but rather employing a large native population which occupied the little narrow streets of mud-brick houses crowded about the centre of the town. There are constant allusions to this native population (λαοί) in the papyri, as workmen, as tenants of the settlers. By and by there are even native soldiers (μάχιμοι) mentioned with small farms of five or seven acres, whereas the Greek farms run from twenty to one hundred acres. But in the earliest settlements, so far as we know them from the Petrie papyri, we find nothing but imported soldiers, *cleruchs* as they are called, coming from all parts of the Greek world—one even from Campania—who had evidently served in the wars, and were veterans liable to be called out for service—a sort of reserve.[1] They were obliged, if cavalry soldiers, to keep horses in proper condition, which were inspected by special officers (ἱππόσκοποι), and there seems to have been a penalty-tax for deficiency either in horses or in riding.[2] There were ranks among the settlers, which we do not understand. Men of the second generation (τῆς ἐπιγονῆς) are often mentioned, but this lasts for several generations. I need not trouble the reader with discussions which have not yet led to any accepted conclusions. So again the *cleruchs* or lot-holders are to a great extent replaced by *catœci* (κάτοικοι), a title which does not appear in our documents for some generations.

---

[1] In Roman times we find them more prominent.

The most important feature of all those disclosed by the Petrie papyri is that the original settlers brought wives with them from their distant homes in the Greek world. For in the wills, which often name the testator's wife, we never have an Egyptian woman, but a Greek with her father's name and country specified. We must imagine these young women sent for from their often poor homes by the successful youths who had emigrated as mercenaries and attained opulence in Egypt. This practice is no doubt the reason that at the outset, and for at least a generation, the Greek written in the Fayyum settlement is no jargon, but clear and good grammatical language, such as they then used in the most civilised parts of the Greek world. There is every evidence of good schooling; some of the correspondents, notably the two sons of Kleon, the commissioner of public works, write very beautiful hands, and one of them most courteous letters;[1] the fragments of the classical authors they read comprise every sort of good Greek literature.

---

[1] When I called them "veterans," my German critics assumed that I meant pensioners, that being the meaning of the word in German. I made no such implication.

[2] ἀνιππεία of Mr. Smyly's note in *Petrie Papyri*, Vol. III, p. 277.

Nothing was more exciting, when I first came to separate and decipher these fragments, than the identification of them, or the establishing that they came from works hitherto lost to us. Homer and Plato were largely represented, the concluding page or two of the *Antiope* of Euripides, fragments of Epicharmus, of epic, tragic, and comic poets, some epigrams, the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, long thought a late composition—these and many fatherless fragments turned up among the contracts and letters written in the middle of the third century B. C. The peculiar thing I longed to find—allusion to contemporary history, or the public affairs of the kingdom—was almost totally absent. There was but one such document, a passage of what seems to have been the public dispatch of the third Ptolemy giving an account of his invasion of Syria and occupation of Antioch—the great campaign known as the Third Syrian War. A few more such texts would, indeed, have illumined the darkness that broods over the public history of Hellenism in the third century.

---

[1] *Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, Plates V and VI.

But among the Fayyum settlers there was, of course, no political life. Though the excavations have shown that there was generally in front of the temple an open space, which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt call the *agora* of the town, there were no assemblies there to pass resolutions or elect magistrates, though they did select respectable citizens to bear state burdens. All the control lay in the hands of crown officials, of whom there were a legion, and all the territory, if not actually crown land, was worked in the interest of the crown, as a direct source of revenue. The old principle of the Pharaohs, which is set forth so nakedly in the book of Genesis, of making the people practically serfs attached to the soil,[1] was not wholly abandoned by the Ptolemies. Of course, the Macedonians and Greeks were granted many privileges, but even in their case there was a minute supervision of their farming. The crops sown in each area are noted, if not prescribed; there were many state monopolies, such as the growing of oil, which was as strictly regulated as is the growing of tobacco in many modern countries. The number and variety of taxes were such that we wonder how even a pittance was left for the actual husbandman. But from the dominant class we hear of no general complaints, though there are often petitions against particular officials for malversation. A *habeas corpus* act seems to have been sorely needed, and indeed ultimately granted, for we have many complaints from prisoners who cannot obtain a trial; yet the judicial arrangements seem to have been ample so far as courts and officers were concerned. We hear of native judges who decided quarrels among natives in their own language and according to their own law; we hear of assize judges (*chrematistæ*), who went on regular circuits; and we have among the papyri which were at Turin—I know not whether they have perished in the conflagration of 1903—a complete account of the decision of this court in a long suit of a Greek soldier against the native corporation of the *Choachytæ* concerning the possession of a disputed plot of building ground over against Thebes. No modern court could be more thorough, more reasonable, more efficient in its judgment after a complete and careful review of all the facts, which stretched over many years of litigation.[1]

---

[1] Gen. xlvii, 20 *sq*.

This trial, however, does not come from the Fayyum, or from the early days of the Greek settlements, when possibly a native corporation would not have received such perfectly fair play from a court of Greeks. The Petrie papyri have disclosed quite another local Greek court, before which various disputes among the Greek settlers were brought. It consisted of five or seven members with a president. The mere results of their decisions in each case were set down in an official record, of which fragments remain.

As might be expected, there are complaints of violences committed by the new settlers upon natives, but these cases seem not frequent. We may assume that the natives, accustomed for thousands of years to the tyranny of the Pharaohs, were thoroughly seasoned to submission, and found the Ptolemies on the whole a satisfactory change. For in strong contrast to the Persians, who had treated the lords of Egypt with contempt, and even hatred, the Ptolemies took care to conciliate the "Established Church," and make that most important of all corporations, the richly endowed priesthood, their supporters. Not only the large gifts and privileges which we find granted to the priests in inscriptions, but the very fact above stated, that in every new town of the reclaimed land in the Fayyum the principal stone building was the temple of the local god with a barbarous name and ritual—all this shows the accommodating policy of these most astute of Hellenists. We know also that no sooner were they secure in the saddle, and recognised as deities of the native Pantheon, than they took care to recover on another account what they had formerly granted. A tax of one-sixth on all the wine of Egypt, then a large product, was made an offering to the deified Arsinoe, second queen of the second Ptolemy, and so passed from the clergy, who had formerly received it in the name of all the gods, directly or indirectly into the possession of the crown.[1]

---

[1] Papyrus I of the Turin collection, ed. A. Peyron.

To sum up all these details: We have in the military colony settled in the Fayyum under the second Ptolemy a crowd of motley Macedonians and Greeks, bringing wives with them from Greece or Greek lands, and holding grants of land on condition of being called out as a reserve force, to some extent equipped with horses of their own keeping. Some of these people mention in their wills that they have town houses in Alexandria, so that continual residence on their new farms was not required.[1] This was natural enough, seeing that they dwelt in open towns without wall or fortification, safe from invasion or disturbance, except from nomad raiders who were kept off by the "desert guards." They allowed the natives to live in their towns and round about, to work for them, and for the many government officials and contractors who kept the public works—irrigation, dykes, roads, etc.—in order.

---

[1] The Rosetta stone, which says that this income was restored to the priests by Ptolemy V, is probably telling a falsehood (*Tebtunis Papyri*, p. 37).

We may infer from their books and their private correspondence that they were a well-educated Greek public, reading their classics and writing their tongue correctly; but so far as the excavations tell us, in ruder dwellings than were usual in Greek lands, and with less elegant appointments. As might be expected from mercenaries by profession, these people were not a religious society. The main gods, the present and ruling Ptolemies, on whom their material happiness depended, were everywhere associated in the temple with its deity as co-templar gods. These isolated colonists appear to us in the first generation of their inland life as a quiet and comfortable society, taking no part in the public affairs of the Greek world, or even of Egypt, and producing, so far as we know, not a single man of note among the leading spirits of that day.

The papyri recovered from the Serapeum of Memphis are of a different character, so that the different story they tell is not by itself a complete proof of a real change; but the later Fayyum papyri amply confirm it. They tell us of the society about the great Serapeum at Memphis, which included in its precinct shrines to gods other than Serapis, both local and Greek. But the general complexion seems to us decidedly more coloured by Egyptian ideas than that of the Fayyum. Our main correspondent, Ptolemy, son of Glaucias, calls himself a Macedonian of the *Epigone*, but his main interest for a long time is to fight the cause of twin girls, Thaues and Taous, who were purely Egyptian servants in the Serapeum, and whose allowances of oil and bread had not been delivered to them by overburdened or lazy or dishonest officials. His correspondence is in Greek quite inferior to the average of the Petrie papyri, nor are the few documents from other heads in the collection any purer. The various persons to whom he alludes show a complete mixture of Greek and Egyptian names, the fashion of having two names, one Greek and one Egyptian, for each member of a family destroying a useful clue to nationality. But there are many small evidences besides that the natives were rapidly growing in influence. Thus Ptolemy, among other complaints, says he suffered violence *because he was a Greek*, though he had lived for years in the Serapeum as a recluse not allowed to go out into the world. This very practice, which some have thought the forerunner of the Christian asceticism in Egypt, is known to us only from these papyri, but that it was not peculiar to Ptolemy is shown by another document, in which a sister-wife (such relations were common and recognised in Egypt) prays her husband, who had escaped with others into this refuge during some dangerous crisis, and was long lost to his family, now to return to his home, and comfort his failing mother, and disconsolate partner.

---

[1] Indeed, their local residence was called *σταθμός* ("quarters '), and not "house."

The letter pleads with affection and with tact. It is very civilised and modern in tone and form. We have fortunately another letter to the same man on the same subject, very different in tone, speaking out very strongly the writer's opinion of a foul desertion of a wife and child for the sake of personal safety, prolonged, too, when it was quite possible to leave his retreat, and when others in the same plight had done so. In fact, it was from these that the distraught family had learned the whereabouts of the missing master of the house.

None of these people tell us how they lived, or what they read; but the general effect produced by these documents is that of a somewhat poor and mean society. Ptolemy solicits the appointment of a younger brother into the ranks of the "resident cavalry" (κάτοικοι) already mentioned. We find the object was to receive the soldier's pay in kind, as a support, not to take social standing, far less to fight for his country.

This is the picture of Memphis and the surrounding villages about the middle of the second century B. C. We hear of the king, Ptolemy VII (Philometor), making proclamations of benevolences (προστάγματα φιλανθρωπίας) in the eighteenth year of his reign (164 B. C.), and we may be sure that, just like those of the fifty-third year of his brother and successor (118 B. C.), they contained no small concessions to the natives, perhaps also some to the Jews, whose importance increased during his reign. We also hear of his paying a visit with the queen and sister, Cleopatra II, to Upper Egypt, and this was, of course, the occasion of many petitions from debtors, prisoners, and captives.

The impression produced by the numerous documents which we have from this and the two succeeding reigns, down to the close of the second century B. C., is not unlike that we may gather from the long struggle of the Irish to regain their wealth and social position from the conquering minority, who invaded their land centuries ago, and dominated the masses as their conquered enemies. The steps, or means of such a recovery, are probably common to all ages, and are therefore well worth considering when we come to the days of decaying Hellenism. Earliest and most potent among its forces are those native young women who, in spite of the proud aloofness of the conquered people, and anxiety of the nationalist to prevent all union, allow themselves to be persuaded into marriage with the invaders. They may be branded as traitorous by their class; they are compensated either by real affection in their husbands, or still oftener by the sweets of social influence. Their children are the first harbingers of a real fusion. But as in Ireland, this fusion is impeded by the forces which make the mother and her native surroundings of far greater influence than the foreign father. As the old Anglo-Irish soon became more Irish than the natives—for they only introduced Anglo-Norman vigour and traditions of conquest into their new country—so I conceive the children of Greek and Macedonians and of Egyptian women to have been far more native than foreign, and, though they adopted Greek names and used Greek speech fluently, to have been no real sustainers of Hellenism. Their creed, and the establishment of their priests by the crown after many a conflict, were another enormous gain. Just as the gradual toleration, and at length the recognition, of the Roman Church have prevented a well-nigh accomplished union of English and Irish, so the great corporations of priests and their huge temples, which the Ptolemies thought it politic to restore, or even to build afresh, stereotyped the people as Egyptians, in spite of Greek courts and laws and officials and books. National aspirations and national grievances could be expressed in Greek as well as in demotic, just as all the struggles and complaints of the Irish have found their voice in English, not in the Irish demotic so difficult for any foreigner to attain. We find the endowment (or re-endowment) of temples going on not only from the policy of the kings, but from the piety of many classes of poorer people.[1] It may be well to note that this gradual recovery of the native complexion of society was not further promoted, as it has been in Ireland, by the acquisition of political power. The Ptolemies were far too wise to entrust the majority with any voting power. There were not senates or assemblies, save at one or two Greek centres, to pass resolutions, or ventilate grievances. The whole pressure, therefore, of the native influence was social, and possibly religious, among a set of invaders who had little faith of their own left.

There is also a certain military element to be taken into account. Polybius tells us that after a contempt of many generations, during which all Egyptian battles were fought by foreign mercenaries, the exigencies of a great crisis —the threatened invasion of the Syrian Antiochus III— set the ministers of Ptolemy IV (Philopator), or perhaps the king himself, to organise the natives into a phalanx, and to this phalanx was wholly due the great victory at Raphia (217 B. C.), which stayed the Syrian danger during the remainder of the king's life.[1] This victory restored to the natives their sense of importance. Then followed internal revolts of serious danger to the crown, which were not appeased without considerable concessions to the soldiers of Raphia. We find that to these *μάχιμοι*, as they were called, lots of five or of seven acres were given as early as the fourteenth year of this reign.[2] The lists published from the papers of Menches by Grenfell and Hunt show a considerable increase in this class, at least in one village under the seventh and ninth Ptolemies, and we know from many collateral sources that the latter (Euergetes II, 146–118 B. C.) adopted a strong nationalistic policy, with which these facts perfectly agree.

---

[1] Cf. *Tebtunis*, p. 62, where such endowments are protected.

But if, as is most likely, one of the just complaints of the phalanx of Raphia was that the military settlers in Upper Egypt were absentee landlords, this evil was remedied and a counterpoise to the predominance of the native veterans provided by creating a resident class of Greek cavalry soldiers (the *κάτοικοι* already mentioned), who received special privileges, including grants of land, if they did not already possess them, and pay in kind, which, we may assume, could be received only on the spot.

---

[1] In an article in *Hermathena*, No. XXIV (1898), I have shown that the ordinary interpretations of Polybius' text are wrong, and that no Hellenistic battle was ever fought with two phalanxes on the same side. There are many other particulars of interest there discussed.

[2] The *Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, 39 (*e*) gives us only the fourteenth year, but there is no probability, in my mind, that this means a date of the third Ptolemy, as Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt think possible (*Tebtunis*, p. 36).

It even appears that here the policy was not absolutely exclusive of natives: some whose race is at least doubtful, on account of their names, became enrolled in this privileged body. But as in earlier days the regiments had been called, not only by their number, but Thracian, Mysian, etc., owing to their earliest complexion into which aliens could enter, just as many Irishmen enlist in the Forty-second Highlanders, or Scotchmen into English regiments, so the body of these regiments remained Greek, and therefore aristocratic.

Such are the general results indicated by the most recent discoveries in Ptolemaic papyri. The mass of village details disclosed by the official papers of Menches, village mayor of Kerkeosiris for several years at the close of Ptolemy IX's and the opening of Ptolemy X's reign, are too petty and too intricate to give us any large or fruitful view of his life and surroundings. There was a vast amount of red tape in the working of his office, which concerned mainly the crops and taxes of the village district. There are not a few signs of chicanery and of the very natural evasion of the many embargoes and restrictions put upon the ordinary buying and selling, the ordinary sowing and reaping, the ordinary lending and borrowing, of the villagers. Onerous public duties, with pecuniary responsibilities, are often evaded by flight to Alexandria or some other town or asylum. The only stray flash of more than local interest is the approaching visit of a Roman senator—L. Memmius—who was visiting Egypt as a tourist. The local authorities are ordered to show him all attention and let him see the labyrinth, the sacred crocodiles, etc., all of which Strabo describes in a similar visit a century later. But this only was the amount of Roman influence which had as yet reached that remote and mysterious outpost of Hellenism. There is in the correspondence of Menches the usual amount of complaints of violent resistance to prying officials, of dependence upon the interest of important people, of efforts to evade the law by subterfuges and delays. Such things are common to all settled societies in which officialdom has become fully developed, and need not here be further cited as any special feature of Hellenism. We can only say that it was a feature which the Greeks found fully established in Pharaonic Egypt, and to which they rapidly acclimatised themselves. If we but had a similar insight into the Syrian society of the Decapolis, we could tell what like or unlike influences coloured Syrian Hellenism. But alas! till the gospels show us Jews and Greeks living together in Palestine, the social history of Syria is a blank page.

The Petrie papyri and the *Persæ* of Timotheus[1] have, moreover, thrown not a little light on many Greek customs and upon the influence which Hellenism had on Roman manners. We now know what were the form and writing of a classical book in the third century B. C., if not the fourth. We now know what was the form of private letters, of testaments, of contracts. There is no probability that these matters were peculiar to the Fayyum society. We now know how papyrus could become as convenient a vehicle for writing as our paper, and how the ink of those days was more lasting than that of our fathers. We now know that the formulæ of politeness used in Roman correspondence were derived from the ordinary practice of the Greeks; nay more, that so strict was the etiquette of letters that we can tell at once from the opening or closing words the relative importance of the sender and the receiver of a letter. "King Ptolemy to Menches, greeting . . . . take care of yourself" (ἔρρωσο), is the one; "To King Ptolemy, Menches, greeting . . . . may fortune favour you" (εὐτύχει), is the other. No further flourishes of style occur, nor do we find in the earliest papers those titles of nobility, "cousin," "friend," "first friend," etc., of the king, which occur in papers later than 200 B. C. These distinctions were most probably a source of income to the crown, seeing that most officials had to present a *στέφανος*, or value of a crown in money, on their appointment. The analogy of James I and his baronetcies will occur to any reader of English history. But, in truth, we are not dealing in ancient history, when we treat of Hellenism, but of a state of civilisation far more advanced and refined than any that succeeded it in Europe for many centuries.

---

[1] This is the libretto of an operatic scene composed and performed by Timotheus, in which the music represented the emotions of the battle of Salamis. Like most of such librettos, it is very bad poetry. It is edited by Wilamowitz, 1904.

CHAPTER IV

HELLENISM IN SYRIA AND IN LOWER EGYPT

I have already alluded to the cities which remained Greek under the Parthian Empire. We know little about them, either as to their number or their importance, except, indeed, that Seleucia on the Tigris was comparable in size with Antioch or Alexandria. This city certainly enjoyed considerable privileges from the Parthian kings, and not the least that they did not quarter their household troops—chiefly Scythian cavalry—upon the citizens, or even within the walls of the town, but at Ctesiphon, the royal residence, some twelve miles from Seleucia. This residence—which, by the way, is also designated a Greek city—stood in some such relation to Seleucia as Versailles to Paris. Nevertheless, the Greek cities felt the yoke, for Josephus tells us[1] that it was at their invitation that Demetrius Soter went into the East, hoping from thence to recover his kingdom. The same inducements may have enticed Antiochus Eusebes to make the same attempt, and with similar, but more fatal, failure. For while Demetrius was taken captive, and sent back again after some years as a claimant to the throne from which a new assailant threatened Parthia, Antiochus Eusebes killed himself when thoroughly defeated, though after some initial successes. The Greek cities, therefore, in Upper Asia enjoyed privileges from, and had complaints against, their Parthian lords.

---

[1] xiv, 5. 11, *καὶ γὰρ οἱ ταύτῃ* (Mesopotamia and the upper provinces) *Ἕλληνες καὶ Μακεδόνες συνεχῶς ἐπρεσβεύοντο πρὸς αὐτόν, εἰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀφίκοιτο, παραδώσειν μὲν αὐτοὺς ὑπισχνούμενοι, συγκαταπολεμήσειν δὲ Ἀρσάκην τὸν Πάρθων βασιλέα.* This resulted in his captivity. We hear that one Parthian king, Phraates, appointed a favourite, Himerus, governor of Babylon, and that this man was tyrant of both Babylon and Seleucia, where he committed many violences. (Posidonius in Müller, *Hist. Græc. Frag.*, Vol. III, pp. 258, 259.)

The same was the case with the many Hellenistic cities of Syria and Palestine, and we are here, fortunately, better informed. In the period now before us (146 to 67 B. C.), which closes with the Roman settlement of Syria by Pompey, Palestine as well as Cœle-Syria was recognised to belong to the lord of Antioch, as had been the case, nominally at least, ever since these lands had been wrested from Egypt by Antiochus the Great. The seventh Ptolemy (Philometor) had, indeed, for a moment conquered Syria, and was actually crowned with the double diadem of Syria and Egypt at Antioch, but his death in battle in that very campaign (147 B. C.) had caused the retreat of his army, and his brother, Ptolemy IX (Physcon), had never essayed the reconquest of Palestine.[1] But Syria from the date just mentioned, and Egypt from the death of Physcon (117 B. C.), fell under the misfortune of perpetually having rival claimants—two brothers, or a queen-mother in conflict with one and allied to the other—a state of things which repeats itself with such a weariness of intricacy that the history of both kingdoms during their decadence is justly abandoned to a few specialists.[2]

---

[1] The details of this history have been dealt with in my *Empire of the Ptolemies* (Macmillan), pp. 422, 423.

[2] We have now a good English book on this subject—Mr. Bevan's *House of Seleucus*.

If the memoirs of this time were preserved to us, no doubt all of these complications of dynastic struggles would regain a lasting interest. For example, Athenæus tells of Alexander Bala, how he had at his court a man of Seleucia, called Diogenes, who posed as an Epicurean philosopher, though the king usually favoured the Stoics. The king humoured him, in spite of his mean qualities, his jealousy, and his backbiting, for the fun of the thing, and even granted his very unphilosophic request to let him wear a purple tunic and a gold crown with a figure of Virtue set in its front, and call himself her priest. These ornaments Diogenes gave away to a singing-woman of whom he was enamoured. Whereupon the king, hearing of this, gave a feast to philosophers and distinguished men, and when Diogenes appeared, asked him where his dress and crown were. Upon his giving an evasive answer, the king ordered the musicians to come before him, when the singing-woman appeared in the philosopher's dress.

This Alexander was of gentle disposition and fond of letters. But Antiochus Sidetes, a much abler man, when he attained the throne, put Diogenes to death, on account of his abusive tongue. Here the contrast of the gentle and laughter-loving Alexander, both to the harsh and unpopular Demetrius and to the downright Antiochus Sidetes, is made clear. It seems that Antiochus did not content himself with silencing Diogenes, but that he expelled all professed philosophers from Syria, as we read in Athenæus.[1] The king's rescript to Phanias (probably his commander-in-chief or prime minister) is quoted verbatim:

---

[1] v, 211; xiii, 547.

> We have already directed you that no philosopher shall stay in the city or district; yet we hear there are not a few, and that they debauch the young, owing to my orders not being carried out. Upon receipt, therefore, of this letter, issue a decree to expel all philosphers, threatening any youths found in their company with hanging, and their parents with the gravest censure. Let there be no mistake about this.

Athenæus is probably right in inferring a great diffusion of Epicurean teaching as to the probable cause of such a decree, if, indeed, it be genuine, which I gravely doubt.

The point of interest to us in the complicated and bloody struggles for the Syrian and the Egyptian succession is that the intermediate and lesser powers—the Jews, and the free Greek cities on the Philistine coast, or in the valleys of the Jordan and the Orontes—were petted and honoured by the rival princes, who were constantly outbidding each other by granting privileges and remitting imposts. It is this condition of the Syrian power which explains the rise and the consolidation of the Maccabees, till with John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus they became strong enough to make conquests and secure for themselves a considerable part of Cœle-Syria. It is this condition of things also which accounts for the importance in population, trade, and wealth of the Greek cities, especially those on the coast, like Ptolemais and Gaza, which obtained from the Syrian kings autonomy, and marked it by dating from an era[1]—most of these local city eras start about 120 B. C.—by a coinage of their own, and by other regular Greek phenomena, such as even the frequent occurrence of tyrants.[1] These cities always paid some tax, levied by themselves upon their citizens, and some contribution of soldiers, to their suzerain. But war was now a lucrative trade, so much so that mercenary service was considered an honour and not a burden by the non-Hellenic population of these lands.[2] And it must have been a safety-valve even for the Hellenistic towns to provide the young and turbulent with foreign service.[3] The weaknesses, therefore, of the great Hellenistic empires were, on the whole, a source of strength and of prosperity to those frequent but isolated cities which represented Greek city culture all through Palestine, Phœnicia, and Syria.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Stark, *Gaza*, p. 474, for details.

But a great danger arose from the action of the same causes upon the nation of the Jews; for, as the Jews grew in power, they developed the notion of a far stricter sovranty over the lands which they incorporated in their empire. Not that the dynasty of the Maccabees was free from Hellenistic influences, or averse to adopting Hellenistic culture. Judas and his brothers were at first little more than Jewish insurgents, who took to the mountains, and maintained themselves as patriot bandits have often done since. When they came gradually to be recognised, and treated by the Seleucids as allies, or provincial governors, according to the needs of the moment, their views expanded, and they developed into Hellenistic princes.

---

[1] Cf. Stark (*op. cit.*, p. 478), who mentions nine of them. He thinks the example of tribal chiefs among the surrounding nomads had some effect on the cities, in addition to the ordinary political causes operating in every small Greek polity of the kind.

[2] Cf. Josephus' citation of edicts granting this favour (*Antiq. Iud.*, xii, 2. 5, 3. 4; xiii, 2. 3).

[3] Cf. Theocritus, xiv, 58 *sq.*, and Herondes, i, 23 *sq.*

[4] The condition of the Roman colonies when the imperial power waned is not without strong analogies. These outlying cities were permitted, or compelled by circumstances, to assert themselves, and ultimately formed the nuclei of new political systems. Had the Roman power not intervened in Syria, and had the Seleucids left no equally vigorous successor, some such results would have ensued.

The interesting thirteenth book of Josephus' *Antiquities*[1] gives ample proof of both policies in the Maccabees —on the one hand, their fierce Semitism in subduing their neighbours and compelling them to adopt Jewish customs; on the other hand, their constant intercourse with Hellenism. The first formal ruler, Simon, who declares Jewish independence in 143 B. C., is indeed called by Josephus *ethnarch* and *Euergetes.*[2] But this may be the translation of a Jewish title into the most current Greek. His successor, Hyrcanus, was defeated by Antiochus Sidetes; yet the conquest only resulted in a closer alliance with the Syrian king. Hyrcanus opened, says Josephus,[3] the tomb of David, and took out 3,000 talents of silver, with which he, first of the Maccabees, raised a mercenary army. He, moreover, accompanied Antiochus with his forces in the campaign against the Parthians. Upon the death of Antiochus, he forthwith, like a true Hellenistic king, set upon the cities of his ally, as well as upon the Idumæans, and made all those he conquered conform to Jewish rites. But while he was a stern nationalist in this respect, he takes pains to send an embassy to Rome, to obtain the support of the Senate against Syria,[4] and the very names of the ambassadors—

---

[1] Especially chaps. viii *sq.* [2] xiii, 6. 7. [3] xiii, 8. 4.

[4] The date appears to be 129 B. C., in which year C. Sempr. Tuditanus and M'. Aquillius were consuls. The text of Josephus has L. Mannius L. f. (xiii, 9. 2).

Simon, son of Dositheus; Apollonius, son of Alexander; and Diodorus, son of Jason; cultivated men (ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί), who doubtless spoke Greek perfectly at Rome—show the worldly side of John Hyrcanus. They were treated with distinction by the Senate, and their expenses for the home journey were defrayed.

The death of Antiochus Sidetes, and the succeeding conflict between two new Antiochuses (Cyzicenus and Grypus) and Alexander Zabinas, gave Hyrcanus rare opportunities. "For after the death of Antiochus he revolted from the Macedonians, and was neither their subject nor their friend, but greatly strengthened his own power and wealth, while they were engaged in mutual conflicts." This was the time he chose to destroy Samaria, a centre not only for the opposing worship of Mount Gerizim, but also for Hellenic religion and manners. Yet the sons whom he sent to perform this national undertaking were called *Antigonus* and *Aristobulus*.

The struggles of Hyrcanus with the Sadducees and Pharisees do not concern us here, interesting as they are,[1] and we pass on to Aristobulus, who turns his high-priesthood into a regular Hellenistic royalty, and assumes the diadem of the Hellenistic kings.

But I will pause for a moment to comment upon another feature in these days of decline and death-struggle among the fragments of Alexander's empire. In Syria, in Judæa, in Egypt, we have queen-mothers left in command, and controlling their sons, the rightful kings, with both force and fraud. Aristobulus began by putting to death his mother (whom Hyrcanus had left in sole control)[1] as well as his brother; the remorse of these crimes brought on him a disease of which he died in a year. He was in policy a Hellenist (*χρηματίσας μὲν φιλέλλην*), but in his conquest of Ituræa compelled all the inhabitants either to migrate or to adopt Jewish rites. Upon his death the widow Salome, called by the Greeks Alexandra, takes, as usual, a prominent part, and sets up as king Jannæus Alexander, who completes the policy of the dynasty by subduing the strong Greek cities of the coast.

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiq. Iud.*, x, 6. 7.

The long war about the coast fortress Ptolemais, in which Ptolemy Lathyrus of Egypt, his regent mother Cleopatra III, with her Jewish generals Chelcias and Ananias, and others, took part, ended in the complete devastation of the coast. The destruction of Gaza, a regular Greek city of very considerable importance, was a death-blow to Hellenistic civilisation in that part of the world.[2] The inhabitants became bandits, mercenaries, and pirates, and the trade of the eastern Mediterranean must have suffered terribly till Pompey pacified the East.

> For then, since there were so many and continuous simultaneous wars, and many cities were cleared of their inhabitants, and even those who had escaped from them were outlaws, so that they were nowhere safe, many men turned to a life of rapine. Now robbery on land, as it was within the observation of settled societies, and left its traces manifest, was sure to be stopped. But piracy became rampant. For the Romans being

---

[1] *ἐκείνην γὰρ Ὑρκανὸς τῶν ὅλων κυρίαν κατελελοίπει* (Josephus, xi, 1). See also *ibid.*, xiii, 16. 6, on the character of Alexandra. He speaks similarly of Tryphæna, Selene, and others.

[2] Ascalon saved itself by timely and complete submission. Ptolemais, the stronghold of the queen Selene, was not taken by Tigranes till just before the advent of Lucullus.

otherwise engaged, it had time to spread widely over the seas, and become organised.[1]

The list of the cities which Hyrcanus conquered is given by Josephus;[2] it includes many of the Greek cities of the interior, such as Scythopolis and Pella, which he destroyed because they absolutely refused to adopt Jewish customs. This, then, was a great and serious blow to Hellenism, perhaps more lasting than was dealt anywhere else in the world, for in other anti-Hellenic conquests the Hellenistic sentiment was still dominant, whereas in Judæa it was overruled in the kings by the narrow and zealous sect of the Pharisees.

It was owing to this wholesale subjugation and even destruction of the Syrian Hellenistic cities that not only the Arabs or Bedouin, who have always infested the inner country, appear now as an important military power invading Syria and Palestine, but also that Tigranes and the Parthians were actually able to subdue and hold Syria. It was, in fact, the advent of the Romans and the reconstitution of these cities by Pompey, and afterwards by Herod, as free Greek cities, which reintroduced a certain spurious kind of Hellenism—Roman Hellenism—into the once well-cultivated and civilised regions of Cœle-Syria, Sidon, and Philistia.[3]

---

[1] Dion Cassius, xxxvi, 3.

[2] *Antiq. Iud.*, xiii, 15. 4.

[3] The accurate determination of the Hellenistic and Aramaic cities respectively is not easy, and has been attempted by B. Stark in his learned and careful book on *Gaza and the Philistine Coast*, pp. 447 *sq.*, as well as by Schürer in his more recent *History of Israel about the Christian Era*. The first point of interest is to separate the Egyptian from the Syrian foundations. Names ending with πόλις point to a usual formation in Græco-Egyptian foundations, and, of course, the Egyptians would naturally establish cities on the

We may judge from the fragments of Posidonius[1] that there had been not only great wealth, but great luxury, in these cities.

> On account of the fertility of the country, and the absence of any necessity for toil, they had frequent meetings, at which they feasted, using their gymnasia as baths, anointing themselves with rich oil and unguents, and dwelling in their schools (so they called their public dining halls) as if in houses, surfeiting themselves there with meats and wines, and even carrying away much; listening to the music of the loud lyre, so that whole cities re-echoed with these sounds.

We might imagine that it was from Tyre and Sidon, as Ezekiel describes them, that these habits were derived; possibly even the famous prophecy against Tyre may have come to the knowledge of the Stoic historian:

> They shall make a spoil of thy riches, and make a prey of thy merchandise; and they shall break down thy walls, and destroy thy pleasant houses; and they shall lay thy stones, and thy timber, and thy dust, in the midst of the water. And I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease; and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard. And I will make thee a bare rock: thou shalt be a place for the spreading of nets.[2]

---

coast, while the lords of Antioch would occupy Cœle-Syria and the inner country. The Seleucidæ also adopted old Greek names, such as Anthedon, Arethusa, instead of the composite Egyptian formations or adaptations of Ptolemaic names. The several cities, or rather the principal men chosen in each for that purpose, arranged the imposts and duties of the town with the royal officers, called ἔπαρχοι or τόπαρχοι, who raised from the country people and non-Greek inhabitants, not only taxes on crops (the third part) and fruit trees (half the produce), but a capitation tax (never levied on the *Greeks*).

[1] Müller, *Hist. Græc. Frag.*, Vol. III, pp. 256 *sq.* The tone of the epigrams composed in these cities, to which I shall revert hereafter, points to the same conclusion.

[2] Ezek., xxvi, 12 *sq.*

The whole description which follows of the trade of Tyre may be fairly applied to the coast cities which succeeded to her mercantile position after her destruction by Alexander. We may also imagine their morals and manners as not better, being largely affected by the troops of rich and pampered mercenaries from Crete, Rhodes, Spain, Galatia, as well as from Greece—a motley crowd in their streets, who spent their ill-gotten wealth in luxury and wantonness.

If we turn to the Egypt of this period (I mean here the Egypt represented by Alexandria and in contact with other Hellenistic lands), we find the same confusion in the royal succession, the same interminable conflicts between mother and son, between rival brothers; and in the capital we observe a distinct decay of Greek, together with a rise of Jewish, influence, especially since two Jews, Chelcias and Ananias, undertook to manage the affairs of Queen Cleopatra III, and refused to attack Palestine when she desired it. The Museum, therefore, was languishing, and Ammonius, who had succeeded to Aristarchus, was far from sustaining the reputation of his great predecessors.

The chief interest which appears in the literature, or fragments of literature, of this period is the interest in geography, as science and exploration. The scientific side belongs to another kind of history,[1] but the adventurous may here occupy us for a short time. The remains of Posidonius show with what interest a Stoic of that day could view the outskirts of the world. It is to this period that I am also disposed to attribute many of the geographical vagaries in the *Life of Alexander*,[1] which became in fact the Alexandrian popular fairy-book, like the mediæval Cairene collection known as the *Arabian Nights*. Regarding the date of the composition of this curious romance, I think the general verdict of critics, that it is a late composition dating from perhaps the first century B.C., or even later, is quite wrong. One striking fact seems to me to decide the matter. There is no allusion whatever, that I can find, to the Ptolemaic dynasty, though the first Ptolemy figures as one of the leading companions of Alexander. Hence I think it impossible that these legends should have grown up in Egypt during the rule of that dynasty. They must have arisen either before it, or after it was forgotten. The latter hypothesis would bring down the composition to a period when Alexander also had paled out in popular imagination. The book therefore appears to me the glowing imagination of the populace of Alexandria during the last days, or very shortly after the death of Alexander, though in our texts it has received many accretions and exaggerations.

---

[1] The great name of Hipparchus, the foremost astronomer in antiquity, marks the period now before us, as he died towards the end of the second century B. C. To treat of his discoveries would be to enter upon the history of Greek science—a formidable study, seeing that we have a very large quantity of Greek mathematics surviving, written in technical language. Cf. the catalogue of the many authors and their writings in Susemihl, *Litteratur der Alexandrinerzeit*, or in Croiset, *Littérature grecque*, Vol. V.

But the account of Eudoxus, the explorer, given us at some length by Strabo, is too instructive not to be related in full. Luckily Strabo has thought fit to tell us the whole story in spite of his unbelief.

Posidonius related that in the days of the second Euergetes (Physcon) there came a certain Eudoxus from

---

[1] Cf. Pseudo-Callisthenes, ed. C. Müller.

Cyzicus to Egypt on an embassy concerning a treaty, and to attend the festival of Persephone, and that he discoursed with the king and his court, particularly about the ascent of the Nile, as he was curious concerning peculiarities of climate, and was an educated man. Now, it happened that at this time there was sent up to the king by those that guarded the mouth of the Red Sea an Indian, who was found half dead in a boat alone, and they could not tell who or whence he was, as they did not understand his speech; so the king ordered him to be taught Greek. When the Indian had learned it, he told them that, sailing from India, he had been driven out of his course and had lost all his comrades by starvation; he also undertook to show the way to the Indies to those appointed by the king, among whom was Eudoxus. They set out provided with presents, and brought back as an exchange cargo spices and precious stones—some of which came down the river with pebbles, some were dug out of the ground, apparently solidified from moisture, like our crystals.

But Eudoxus was cheated of his expectations, for the king appropriated the whole of the cargo. The king's death supervening, his widow Cleopatra III assumed the power, and by her Eudoxus was again sent out with ampler means. On his way he was carried by winds beyond Ethiopia, and conciliated the natives whom he reached with gifts of corn and wine and sweet cakes, which they did not possess, and they allowed him in return a supply of water, and directed his course for him; he also wrote down some words of their language. Moreover, finding on the shore a wooden figure-head with a horse carved on it, he learned that it was the wreck of a ship with people who had come from the west, and he brought this figure-head home with him. When he got back to Egypt, it was no longer Cleopatra, but her son, who reigned, and again his whole cargo was seized; for he was convicted of having abstracted a great deal after his former voyage. The figure-head he brought down to the merchant harbour in Alexandria, where it was at once recognised as belonging to Gades, where the greater merchants fit out large ships, the poorer small ones, which they call "horses," from the form of the figure-head; and these sail as far as the river Lixus to fish on the coast of Mauretania. Some of the skippers at Alexandria pronounced this figure-head to belong to one of these ships, which had gone too far along the coast, and had never returned.

When Eudoxus drew from this the conclusion that Libya must be circumnavigable, he went home, and realised all his property to stake it upon this venture. And first he went to Dicæarchia (Puteoli), then to Massilia (Marseilles), and then along the coast as far as Gades (Cadiz), making careful enquiries everywhere, and at last succeeded in fitting out one large vessel and two smaller of the nature of piratical barks, in which he embarked slaves trained in music, and physicians and other artists, and set sail for the Indies across the high seas with a steady west wind. But when his crews were weary with voyaging, he was obliged to put in to the shore, which he greatly feared on account of the flux and reflux of the tides. And the very thing he anticipated really occurred. His big ship grounded, but quietly, so that it did not go to pieces until all the cargo and most of the timber were carried on shore. Out of the latter they constructed a new boat in the shape of a *penteconter*, and then sailed onward till he came to people speaking the same tongue of which he had already (as has been told) written down words. Accordingly, he discovered that these people were akin to the former Ethiopians he had met, and that they were neighbours to the kingdom of Bogos. He then abandoned the journey to the Indies and turned homeward, and, as he went along, noted an island, well watered and wooded, that was not inhabited. When he got back to Maurusia (western Mauretania), getting rid of his ships, he crossed by land to Bogos, and advised the king to take up the enterprise; but the king's counsellors prevailed against the traveller by showing the danger of attacks from any outside people upon the kingdom, when the way was discovered. So when Eudoxus found out that they were going to send him out nominally in command of the proposed expedition, but that the real design was to leave him on some desert island, he escaped into the Roman province, and thence crossed to Iberia. Having again provided himself with a merchant ship and a long pinnace, so that he could keep at sea in the one and make expeditions along the shore with the other, he set out on the same journey, carrying with him farming utensils, and seeds, and masons, with this intention that, if delayed on the voyage, he could winter on the island he had already observed, and, having taken out a crop, could use this supply to complete the expedition on which he was determined.

"So far," said Posidonius, "I can go in the narrative about Eudoxus; but what happened afterwards I suppose the people of Gades and from Iberia would know."

This whole narrative, so profoundly interesting in disclosing to us a man with the boundless resource and ambition of a Columbus, and like him misled by underrating the size of the earth, strikes Strabo as a mere string of lies, either invented by Posidonius or told him by the inventor. As regards Posidonius himself, he was a man of high character, a Stoic philosopher, and more worthy of credit than Strabo; nor is it likely that, being a good traveller, and a much-experienced man, he would be fooled by any mere inventions. We may therefore be sure that there was considerable foundation for the whole account, however inaccurately the details may have been reported.

Here are the main points of Strabo's criticism: How could any Indian be cast upon the shore of the Red Sea, for this sea is very narrow at the mouth, and therefore landing would be easy outside? How could a single survivor manage a considerable ship? How did he learn Greek so quickly as to persuade the king to carry out his plan? How could Euergetes want information from such a guide, seeing that the road to India was already well known? How was it that a stranger from Cyzicus should first be entrusted with such an expedition, then deprived of all he brought back, and then again trusted with another command? Why was he surprised at the figurehead, seeing he himself must have come from the coast? How could he return home, for nobody was allowed to leave Alexandria without a passport, and this man had appropriated royal property? "Nor could he sail out secretly, the harbour and all other exits being carefully guarded by custom-house officers, who even now remain, as I know from having lived some time in Alexandria, though things are much relaxed since the Roman sway; then the royal guards were far more strict;" etc., etc. He concludes by saying that, if each of these details is not in itself impossible, their combined occurrence is out of question.

So far as the first part of the critique goes, it is simply upset by supposing that the solitary "Indian" was driven, not from the east, but from the south, and that he really belonged to the African coast, or to Madagascar. The rest of Strabo's objections seem to me so foolish as not to require any answer. The account of Eudoxus' difficulties, and especially of his turning about when he had got a long way on his first journey, is no doubt incomplete; but either want of provisions or a mutiny among his crew is a natural and adequate cause for such a failure, even in an enthusiast, as he seems to have been. The date of these adventures is very well defined by the death of Ptolemy IX and the regency of his widow, with whom her son was associated shortly after; they must lie within 120–112 B. C.

Even the enthusiasm of remarkable individuals arises out of the circumstances of their generation, and we have ample evidence remaining to show that in this case an educated man might find plenty of books to excite his imagination and fire his ambition for discovery. The unity of Roman sway must have tended to increase the knowledge of, and stimulate the interest in, outlying countries. For the same armies now fought with Spaniards on the far coast of Spain, with the wild tribes of Africa beyond the bounds of Numidia, with the savage Batavians of the North, with the Illyrians of the Balkan peninsula;

while the southern regions of the Red Sea—the Nubians, Abyssinians, and Troglodytes—had been long since a subject of interest to the Ptolemies. The great geographical stimulus given to the world by Alexander the Great seems now in some sense renewed, for from the authors of the day we can select no inconsiderable number who devoted themselves to descriptive geography, especially noting the *paradoxa*, or strange phenomena, which the traveller might witness in each province of the world.

The first man who got the title of Περιηγητής (which may be best translated as "guide") was Polemo, early in the second century B. C., and he wrote tracts on all the special art-centres of Greece, as well as on *marvels*—apparently a series of handbooks which were the earliest forerunners of our Murrays and Baedekers. Long before his time there had been local *cicerones*, who explained the curiosities of their native towns to such stray travellers as Herodotus or the elder Scylax. But now, with the increased solidarity of the world, and the great growth of travelling, both for trade and for amusement, educated people wanted some safer and more cultivated director, especially on the antiquities of historic cities. In the last quarter of the second century B. C. we have Mnaseas of Patræ, Agatharchides of Cnidus, Metrodorus of Scepsis, Artemidorus of Ephesus, Demetrius Callatianus, Diophantus, Basilis,[1] and within the next twenty years Alexander Polyhistor and the so-called Scymnus of Chios, all composing this sort of book. It is remarkable also that most of them made epitomes from their own, as well as from earlier works, showing that they lived not only in an age of reading, but in an age of hurry, when men wanted knowledge packed together in the smallest compass. The curiosity of Roman tourists, who were both wealthy and ignorant, and who now crowded into Greece and Asia Minor, gave the same peculiar scope to enterprising cicerones that the influx of Americans to Europe has given in our own day. Nevertheless, I have not yet found a Hellenistic Cook who conducted tours.

---

[1] Cf. Müller, *Geographi Græci*, Vol. I, p. lviii.

Of two of these geographical authors enough has survived to give us a good idea of the kind of work popular at the epoch which is now before us. The five books of Agatharchides on the Red Sea, under which he includes all the seas washing Arabia, were used by Diodorus so freely in his third book, and excerpted so copiously by Photius, that we seem to possess them almost complete. The author speaks of himself as an old man placed in the onerous and responsible position of tutor to a young king of Egypt, whom most critics take to be Ptolemy X (called Soter II and Lathyrus).[1]

The most striking passage in the book, so far as we know, is the description of the terrible slavery endured in the Nubian gold mines, where a whole population of condemned people, with women and children, laboured night and day under the lash to hack out quartz rock in veins deep under the earth, to bring this quartz to the surface, and then to crush it and extract the gold. The details of the "hewers" with their lamps tied round their heads, the "shifters," the "underviewers" superintending, the children used for carrying—all this reminds one strongly of the process to be seen any day in the English coal mines.[1] This mining with convict labour, now carried out so diligently by the Ptolemies, was a mere inheritance from the Pharaohs, whose despotism had been exercised for many centuries upon their subjects in many terrible ways, but in none more awful than this sustained cruelty in the sleepless search for gold in the bowels of the earth.

---

[1] There are not wanting reasons which induced Niebuhr, and since his day Droysen and Hiller (*Jahn's Jahrbücher*, 1867, p. 597), to ascribe this passage to Aristomenes, the well-known tutor and regent of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes). Even if this be the case, it is probably an extract from Aristomenes quoted by Agatharchides.

The African shore of the Red Sea was studded all the way down to its mouth with stations established by the earlier Ptolemies; for they had soon discovered that it was far easier to bring up the treasures of the South, especially elephants, by coasting vessels than by the Nile,[2] where the cataracts made unshipping necessary, and where in any case the Nile voyage was very circuitous. The names of these stations, which were almost all called after Egyptian captains and explorers—we know some thirty of them[3]—show us that such voyages were at first voyages of discovery, where the names of stations are naturally derived from the circumstances of the moment. The peculiarities of the Troglodytes are given with considerable detail, and so are the varieties of the customs in different tribes. Thus those that kill elephants—they used huge bows and arrows, which were worked by three men together, two holding the bow planted in the ground, and the third drawing the string—would not desist from their stupid waste of these precious animals, which they massacred (as the American Red Indians did the buffaloes), though Ptolemy,[1] king of Egypt, offered them all kinds of wonderful inducements to desist. On the other hand, there were savages who risked their lives and lost some men in capturing a huge snake for Ptolemy Philadelphus, as they knew the king's desire to have such things in his zoölogical gardens. They ultimately drove it into an enormous wicker trap (lobster pot) prepared for the purpose, and this snake was tamed, and was for a long time on show at Alexandria.[2] The navigation of the Red Sea is very carefully described, with all its dangers, which the Ptolemies sought to diminish by leaving wrecked ships where they had stranded by way of warning. This was a royal πρόσταγμα.

---

[1] C. Müller, *Geographi Græci*, Vol. I, pp. 124 *sq.*, who gives both Diodorus (iii, 12, 13) and Photius' excerpts from Agatharchides. The evidence on these hardships is quite uniform. From the *Digest* (viii, 19. 28) Mr. L. C. Purser quotes to me: *proxima morti pœna metalli coercitio*, which agrees perfectly with the words of Diodorus: "There is no pity or remission of labour whatever for the feeble, or the maimed, or the aged, or for the weaker sex; all are forced with stripes to slave at their work till they die of their hardships. Wherefore these wretched people look to the coming day as worse than the present, by reason of the exceeding greatness of their punishment, and accept death as a blessed escape from life." Cf. on the ruins of Laurium above, p. 11.

[2] In a curious Petrie fragment the writer of a letter anticipates scarcity of provisions ἀφ' οὗ ἡ ἐλεφαντηγὸς κατεποντισθῇ, which suggests that the elephant transports carried supplies for the outlying stations and brought elephants home. Cf. *Petrie Papyri*, Vol. II, p. 37.

[3] Cf. Müller, *Geographi Græci*, Vol. I, p. lx, and Strabo.

The result of all this was, of course, to turn the once peaceful inhabitants of the Arabian coast into pirates,[3] who became as bad as the Tauric people in the Euxine, and had to be checked by the severest punishments, being apparently drowned whenever they were caught on the sea. The wealth of the Sabæans on account of their spices is described as most extraordinary, and on the coast adjoining their territory were to be seen at anchor ships from the farthest East as well as from Greek Egypt, all trafficking for this unique luxury.

---

[1] Probably Ptolemy II, according to the "stone of Pithom," recently discovered and explained by Mr. Flinders Petrie and Mr. Naville.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 162–64.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

To these serious dangers of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean as they appeared to the Greeks of Alexandria, we may perhaps add a word on the comic side of the matter from a strange document recently unearthed by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, and printed in their third volume of the Oxyrynchus papyri.[1] This fragment presents us with a dramatic farce of the broadest kind, written to be acted on some popular stage, such as those of our modern music halls. The actual text is not earlier than Roman times, about the end of the first century A. D., but the whole spirit, if I mistake not, is rather of Hellenistic than of Roman times. It is a rude parody of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and represents a Greek gentleman with a low skipper and his lower crew, going to rescue his sister who is detained (as a priestess) by a savage king in the temple of his gods. The object of the crew is more than to rescue the lady. They have brought with them wine, wherewith they propose to make the king and his retinue drunk, and then carry off the treasures of the temple along with the lady. She protests that such sacrilege is shameful and dangerous, but the clown of the piece tells her to look the other way while the theft is being committed. The king, who talks passages of some outlandish tongue, possibly Canarese, is attended by an escort of Amazons with long bows, who all but shoot the clown. The whole attitude of the piece, with which alone we are here concerned, is that of freebooting and plundering far-off natives by force and fraud, not a whit more civilised a proceeding than that of the Phœnician traders and kidnappers in Homer's *Odyssey.*

---

[1] No. 413. It can now be more easily procured in Professor O. Crusius' fourth edition of *Herondas and Other Mimes* (Teubner, 1904).

I have given these details, culled from a vast array of facts, in order to show what sort of knowledge had become interesting to the Hellenistic world of that day.

The metrical geography, commonly entitled the περιήγησις, of Scymnus of Chios, is a specimen of another kind of popular book in these after-days of culture. It was a metrical handbook, giving a compendium of the accredited researches of older authors on geography, and professing no originality. It belongs, therefore, to that large class of abbreviated books which were at this time brought out to suit the hurry and the superficiality of the age. Such, for example, was the abridgment of Mago's twenty-eight books on husbandry, reduced to six.[1] What remains of Scymnus is about one thousand verses, in iambic metre, but with the licenses of comic iambics. The existing portion refers altogether to Europe, including the shores of the Euxine, and is valuable in giving the dates of a good many early Greek colonies, such as Massilia, which we should not otherwise have known. The author begins with a sort of dedicatory epistle (135 lines), which is so characteristic and so unknown among ordinary scholars that I shall here give a free translation of it:

May it please your sacred majesty, Nicomedes. The language and metre of comedy has this most desirable virtue, that it tells everything tersely and clearly, and delights every sane critic. Wherefore, having proved the persuasiveness of its diction, I formed the ambition to approach you through it in a brief discourse, and to offer you this handy and useful compendium, as through you I shall make it of public service to all those who seek information. As I desire, therefore, at the outset to expound to you the method of the whole treatise, I beg you will allow me a few words by way of preface; I am resolved to speak laconically—very little upon very large subjects. Here is what I have to say.

---

[1] Above, p. 6.

For the use of the kings of Pergamum, whose glory, though they are gone, yet lives on amongst us for ever, one of the genuine Attic philologers (Apollodorus), having been a hearer of Diogenes the Stoic, and a long time at school with Aristarchus, composed a *Chronography* reaching from the capture of Troy to the present day. He expounded a period of 1,040 years, recounting the taking of cities, the expeditions of armies, the wanderings of nations, the incursions of barbarians, the course of naval operations, public games, treaties, battles, the acts of kings and other celebrated men, the removal of tyrants—an epitome of all that is told diffusely; and he preferred to set it forth in metre, and chose the comic,[1] for the sake of clearness, and seeing that it would thus be most easily committed to memory. He takes an illustration from life. If a man wants to carry a number of logs, he could not do it unless he tied them together; so a metrical story has its advantage over prose. He then, having gathered the chronicle of time into this summary, paid the compliment of dedicating it to King Philadelphus, which, becoming known all over the world, conferred immortal glory on that Attalus whose name appeared in the dedication.

But I, hearing that you alone of present kings show royal graciousness, thought I would make trial of it and present myself to see what a king is like, that I might have it to tell to others. Wherefore I chose for a supporter of my project him who both established your father in his kingdom, as we hear, and who is truly in all respects honoured by you also—I mean Apollo the

[1] So Strabo says, p. 677.

Didymæan, the prophet and leader of the Muses. Trusting in him, I come to your hearth, which is well-nigh free to all literary men, and may he help my undertaking! For from the scattered materials in various histories I have written for you in epitome the colonisations and foundings of cities, and the ways by sea and land over all the earth. Passing over the obvious things briefly, I have dwelt upon the less known, so that you may have, O King, a short description of the whole habitable earth, the peculiarities of great rivers, and the situation of the two continents; also what are the Greek cities in each, who founded them, and when, who the surrounding barbarians are—nomadic or tame, and of their manners and customs, which of them are the most inhospitable and savage; the amount of populations, and their various laws and habits, and the richest trading marts, as also the islands [*and so on*]; so that he who hears (it read) will not only be diverted, but will get, if nothing else, this useful information, to know where he is, and where his own country lies, and from what mother-city it received its inhabitants. To sum it all up, without undertaking the wanderings of Ulysses told in story, but remaining comfortably at home, he may learn not only the life of foreign races, but the cities and the laws of all nations. But my book, receiving you as its illustrious sponsor and benevolent patron, will pass through the labour of its birth into life, and will herald your glory, O King, to all, carrying your good report from place to place even to the ends of the world.

And now at the outset I will enumerate the authors on whose authority I have made my statements. I place most reliance in Eratosthenes, the most eminent of geographers, as to climate and configuration of lands; in Ephorus and Dionysius of Chalcis, on the founding of cities; in Demetrius Callatianus, the Sicilian Cleon, and Timosthenes [*then the MS. is mutilated and illegible for some lines*] Timæus, and what Herodotus has said. In other cases I have brought my own diligent enquiry and personal observation to bear, having seen not only the cities in Greece and Asia, but knowing the regions of Adria and the Ionian Sea, and having travelled as far as Tyrrhenia and Sicily westward, as well as through most of Libya and Carthage.

He then proceeds at once to his description of Europe. A scrap of the following part (on Asia) is also preserved.

The very curious and instructive passage above translated shows us that we are dealing with a society more like that of our eighteenth century than any that intervened. Literary men were seeking out noble patrons, and carefully informing them that their patronage was not only profitable to the recipient, but honourable to themselves. Under these circumstances we may be sure that the flattery of the Hellenistic authors did not fall short of the exhibitions of it to be seen in the dedications of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, in the present instance commentators justly, I think, refuse to believe that our author would have addressed Nicomedes II in these terms, seeing that this Nicomedes had put to death his father Prusias, a monster of iniquity.[1] This parricide, however the circumstances palliated his crime, would have afforded a curious commentary on the poet's allusions to Apollo as the patron of both father and son.

It is, indeed, novel, nay, positively comical, to find the authors of "handy guide-books" dedicating them to kings, and speaking of the celebrity which this would confer. In our day the compiler is neither so ambitious nor so self-important. But we must imagine Scymnus writing, not for an old and settled society, like that of Athens or Argos, but for those new and outlying kingdoms where many Syrians, Gauls, Armenians, and Jews entered Greek cities, got civic rights, and desired to acquire Greek civilisation in a hurry. For these people short-cuts to knowledge would be as important as they now are for the Americans who make rapid fortunes in new western cities of the States. These rough-and-ready business people find themselves suddenly wealthy enough to live cultivated lives, but no antecedents to enable them to do it. And so they must strive to attain by the shortest route manners and ideas foreign to their birth and breeding.[1] Here, then, compendiums are in high favour, and many a millionaire would be very proud to accept such a dedication as that which I have just transcribed.

---

[1] See the whole story of his revolt (aided by Aristomenes) told in Appian, *Mith.*, 3 *sq*. Mommsen decides in favour of Nicomedes III.

[1] The reader to whom this most interesting phase of modern society is not familiar may study it in Mr. Howells' *Rise of Silas Lapham.*

CHAPTER V

THE ACCLIMATISATION OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN ROMAN SOCIETY

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of Greek philosophy than its diffusion and vitality in the period before us, in spite of the insignificance of the men who were then the recognised leaders of the schools. The succession of the various scholarchs has been a subject of curiosity ever since the Christian era, and has given rise to many tracts, down to the famous essay of Zumpt.[1] But in almost every case we now find a mere name sustaining the responsibility, or at least occupying the place, of a Chrysippus or an Epicurus. Perhaps the first thing that strikes us when we scan the list of these names in Diogenes Laertius, in the columns of Clinton's *Fasti*, or in the labyrinthine footnotes of Zeller's *History of Philosophy*, is that they hail from all parts of the Hellenistic world. It is hard to say that any portion of Alexander's empire was more prolific in philosophers than the rest. My impression is that Greece proper was somewhat poorer and Syria somewhat richer than the average, but I will not venture to assert this positively. The coast of Cilicia was perhaps more likely to produce Stoics, owing to the causes adduced in a previous volume of this social history;[2] but certain it is that Babylon, Seleucia on the Tigris, Tyre, Sidon, Gadara, Apamea, Antioch, Soli, Alexandria, Tarsus, Cyzicus, Heraclea, and a hundred other cities, sent philosophers into the world, who, while they settled at Rome or Athens or Rhodes, nevertheless did not belie their origin, and were known as the glory of their native cities. But though these men were acute or laborious enough to gain reputation by their books, or even to rise to the position of head of an Athenian school, we cannot find that, with one notable exception, they made any permanent advance in real thinking.

---

[1] "Über den Bestand der philosophischen Schulen," *Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1843.

[2] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 142. If the edict referred to above (p. 62) was really issued by Antiochus Sidetes against young men

The fact is that most of the scholarchs mentioned are remarkable for the number of their years, so that the schools must have been usually presided over by old men. The natural tendency of this condition of things is, first, to make the teaching conservative, clinging to the traditions of former days and revolving round the ideas acquired in the professor's youth; second, to make it timid, not daring to face new problems, or even to defend the startling paradoxes, the extreme views, which had been boldly asserted in the rejuvenescence of Greek philosophy. This timidity often took the form of contracting the outworks, and sacrificing the points most liable to attack — nay, even of conceding to the opponents that they were in some respects right, or to the sceptics that, after all, nothing was certain. It may, therefore, be said of the second century B. C. that it was the period when the schools were very strictly preserved, but when the sceptical doc-

---

learning philosophy, this may be another reason why so many Syrians appear as philosophers at Athens and in the West in this and the next generation.

trine of Pyrrho, which had been blown to the winds in the days of great original thinkers and of profound convictions, saw its seed taking root in other schools, and producing not only a general distrust of all dogmatic philosophy, but a distinct development of negative and destructive thinking.

Hence we find this sceptical tendency showing itself in Arcesilaus, who belongs to the earlier years of the second century B. C., but patent in the one man to whom I have pointed as a brilliant exception—Carneades, the founder of the so-called "New Academy," which was in reality no development of Plato's Academy, but rather a sceptical onslaught on the only system which still put forward any bold claims to preaching absolute truth—and this was clearly the Stoic.

We know a great deal about the personality of Carneades, though he left no writings; he was the founder of the only new school of note since the third century, and we have in Cicero a full account of the doctrines of his successor, Antiochus. The scepticism of Carneades was very keen and brilliant, though he had no great trouble in overthrowing the physical and logical positions of the dogmatists of those days; in fact, the means of attack, both in arms and in argument, were then far stronger than the means of defence. But Carneades was not content with merely refuting the Stoics; he was perhaps the first to elaborate a *doctrine of probability*, which to a sceptic like him was the only guide of life, and which he applied specially to ethics, as the practical side of philosophy immediately concerned with human happiness and misery.

The logical outcome of this systematic refutation of all absolute dogmas, and the substitution in their place of probable assertions, was clearly *eclecticism*—the selecting from various systems their strongest and most practical conclusions, and making the selection the guide of life. This accordingly became the prevalent fashion of the schools in the commencement of the first century B. C. But, in addition to the home forces which urged philosophy in this direction, there was an important external factor—the influence of Roman life and the demands of Roman society. This is, therefore, what we must trace through the second century before we can speak of the eclecticism which took possession of Greek thinkers, till deeper wants brought out the deeper convictions of neo-Platonism.

The first essays at introducing Greek wisdom to Rome—I mean abstract wisdom— are so spasmodic that they are rather curious than instructive. We have no information about the motives of Ennius in reproducing the impious fables of Euemerus in Latin. The work had been long discredited in the Greek world as a conglomerate of lies and blasphemy, having some loose connection with the Epicurean notions of religion, in that it asserted the gods to be mere glorified men who had done good to the human race in old times. But not even the shabbiest Epicurean would have accepted it in the second century as an exposition of his views. Seeing, therefore, that Ennius was attached to particular Roman nobles, such as the Fulvius, whom he accompanied to Ætolia in 189 B. C., I suppose it was merely to please some individual that the poet transcribed the Messenian's rude assault upon faith and dogma into Latin. It does not appear to have had much success, though it is likely that the Epicurean system, from its simplicity and vulgarity, would most easily attract the Romans who were first let loose upon the East.

It must have been within a few years of Ennius' performance—for we are now to speak of the year 181 B. C.—that a bold attempt was made to pass off Greek dogmas under the ægis of Numa's name. The story is told by Livy (xl, 29) as follows:

> In that year the labourers on the farm of L. Petilius the scribe, under the Janiculum, digging somewhat deeper than usual, found two stone chests, about eight feet by four each, their lids being fastened down with lead. The chests were inscribed with Latin and Greek letters (respectively), to the effect that in the one Numa Pompilius, son of Pomponius, king of Rome, was buried; in the other were contained the books of Numa. When, after consulting with his friends, the owner of the farm had opened these chests, that which had the title of the buried king was found empty, without trace of human remains or anything else, all being gone with the decay of centuries. In the other were two bundles containing seven books each, not only undamaged, but perfectly new in appearance. The seven Latin were on pontifical law, the seven Greek on the theory of wisdom, which might have belonged to that age. Valerius Antias [the historian] adds that these latter were Pythagorean books, the vulgar belief that Numa was a disciple of Pythagoras having evidently suggested this plausible fiction. The books were first read by the friends who were there when they were opened; presently, when they were becoming common property, according as more people got access to them, Q. Petilius, then *prætor urbanus*, borrowed them from L. Petilius in order to read them; and this was a common practice of his, as when quæstor he had chosen Lucius as secretary for his

decuria. When a cursory study had shown him that most of the contents would tend to upset existing religious services, he told Lucius that he was going to throw the books into the fire, but that before he did so, he would let Lucius try whether by action at law or in any other way he could make good his claim to recover them; and that, if he did so, the prætor would regard it merely as a friendly suit. The scribe appealed to the tribunes of the plebs, who referred it to the Senate. The prætor offered to take an oath that in his opinion these books should not be read or preserved. The Senate decreed that it was satisfied with the prætor's oath, that the books should be burned in the comitium as soon as possible; that damages should be paid for them to the owners, according to a price fixed by the prætor and the majority of the tribunes. This money the scribe refused to accept. The books were accordingly publicly burned in the comitium, in a fire made by the *victimarii*.

That some deliberate fraud was here at work is almost certain. But in whose interest was it attempted? The alarm of the prætor and Senate is easily to be accounted for when we remember that only five years before there had been literally a state panic about the *Bacchanalia*, which were forbidden by law and numerous adherents punished with death.[1] We may even suppose that the documents were in some way connected with this superstition, and hidden away under ground, when the searching and bloody enquiry of the year 186 was going on. This is far more likely than the suggestion that sober Greek doctrines were promoted by such sensational tricks.

But we have no facts left to help us, except the clear evidence that novelties in religion and philosophy attracted the Roman public, and alarmed the Roman government. If so, we are not surprised that in 173 B. C. they expelled from Rome two obscure Epicurean teachers, Alcius and Philiscus, because they were corrupting the Roman youth.[1]

---

[1] Livy, xxxix, 8 ff., and the well-known *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, published in all collections of early Latin inscriptions.

The next step of the Senate was taken in 161 B. C., and affected both Greek philosophers and rhetors; I believe it to have been mainly directed against the rhetors, who undertook to teach the Roman youth the art of persuasion, and were accordingly expelled from the city.[2]

It is quite possible that this decree is to be brought into connection with the importation of all the Greek and Macedonian exiles after the victory of 168 B. C. I have elsewhere observed[3] how completely these educated exiles disappear from notice when once interned in Italy, and I therefore disagree with Zeller,[4] who assumes that many of them lived, like Polybius, in daily intercourse with great Roman nobles. I consider Polybius to have been quite an exception, and that the tribe of Greeks flooding Rome, which he himself mentions contemptuously to young Scipio,[5] were people of a totally different rank of life and character. But still the enormous number of Greek-speaking and Greek-educated men reduced to misery in Italy must have contained many anxious to earn their bread even by the humblest kind of teaching, and it was plainly the policy of the Senate to have them interned in obscure towns of Italy, not at Rome, where they might do mischief.

---

[1] Our authority is here Athenæus, xii, 547, who mentions L. Postumius as consul. This gives us our choice between 173 and 155 B. C., but I prefer the former, for had this interference with the Epicureans taken place in 155 B. C., the very year after the embassy of the three philosophers from Athens to Rome, we may be sure that Cato would have been mentioned as a mover in the matter, and it would also have been mentioned in connection with that embassy.

[2] These expulsions of philosophers were not, as we have seen, confined to Rome. The decree of Antiochus Sidetes (above, p. 62), which I have quoted from Athenæus, might have been penned by Cato himself. It refers, too, specially to the young. We hear of the Epicureans being expelled from Messene, at what time we know not (Suidas, *s. v.* Ἐπίκουροι).

[3] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 562.

[4] *Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. III, 1, p. 532, note.

[5] Polybius, xxxii, 10.

As in the case of Scipio, so the story went that Æmilius Paullus had already, after his victory over Perseus, asked the Athenians for a good painter and a sound philosopher, and that they sent him Metrodorus, who excelled in both.[1]

There may have been other isolated cases. But when Cicero[2] argues that there must have been many leading

---

[1] This story, told by Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, xxxv, 135), seems to be inconsistent with the famous narrative of Polybius (xxxii, 9. 10), which implies distinctly that there was no rival Greek educator in the house. The latter says, in fact, expressly that, if Scipio wants mere instruction, there is a whole tribe of such Greeks pouring into Rome, whom he can easily employ. This either means that there was no Metrodorus in the house, or that Polybius chose deliberately to ignore him as an impostor. For the alleged invitation of Paullus and the settlement of Polybius in his mansion must be proximate in date, both having happened shortly after the battle of Pydna. The general statement of Plutarch (*Æm. Paullus*, 6) that not only grammarians and sophists and rhetors, but also sculptors and painters and dog- and horse-trainers and teachers of hunting—all Greeks—were kept about his children, seems to me also vague, and not consistent with Polybius. It is a question, and perhaps a grave one, whether the Greek historian has not exaggerated his own influence in the education of Scipio Æmilianus. This suspicion is greatly strengthened in my mind by the utter silence of Polybius concerning Panætius, who was certainly another Greek friend and adviser of Scipio. It is hardly possible that Panætius did not come into the house till Polybius had returned to Greece after 146 B. C. But this *may* be the explanation. Yet Cicero (*de repub.*, i, 21) speaks of Panætius and Polybius being together with Scipio. Had he any further evidence than we have?

[2] *Tusc. quæstt.*, iv, 3: "Sapientiæ studium vetus id quidem in nostris; sed tamen ante Lælii ætatem et Scipionis non reperio, quos

Romans devoted to Greek philosophy at this time, for otherwise the Athenians would not have rooted out from their scholastic seclusion three philosophers to plead their cause in Rome, he is clearly wrong. For more than one hundred and fifty years it had been the fashion in any great crisis to ask the scholarchs, the grave and solemn philosophers, who took no direct part in politics, to represent states on embassies, just as the bishops in the early Middle Ages went, or as the heads of colleges now go, on a deputation of importance to the prime minister in London.[1]

This mission, however, of the three heads of the principal schools of Athens — Critolaus the Peripatetic, Diogenes the Stoic, and Carneades the Academic—marks an epoch, slightly earlier, indeed, than the period we are discussing, but still convenient as the new starting-point, when Greek philosophy began to assert itself openly at Rome. The mission in question took place in 156–155 B. C., and the case to be argued by the three envoys was a very bad one. They wished to obtain the remission of a fine of 500 talents imposed by arbitration on the Athenians for violating the territory, and plundering the property, of the people of Oropus.

It turned out that their official mission was the least important side of the visit. After their first audience

---

appellare possim nominatim. Quibus adolescentibus, Stoicum Diogenem et Academicum Carneadem video ad senatum ab Atheniensibus missos esse legatos, qui quum reipublicæ nullam unquam partem attigissent, essetque eorum alter Cyrenæus, alter Babylonius, nunquam profecto scholis essent excitati, neque ad illud munus electi, nisi in quibusdam principibus temporibus illis fuissent studia doctrinæ." He might as well argue that Alexander's regent Antipater studied philosophy because Xenocrates was selected to go before him at a critical moment.

[1] I have already commented on this practice, *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 132.

with the Senate, at which C. Acilius acted as interpreter, there appears to have been intentional delay, in order that the famous teachers might give some public lectures at Rome. This they did with considerable success. But doubtless the results would have been much greater had not two of the ambassadors, Critolaus and Diogenes, been very old men, and evidently past doing this kind of work effectively. I have above commented on this weakness in the Greek schools and its results at home. Critolaus is, indeed, left out in many of our accounts,[1] simply, I fancy, for this reason. Nor did Diogenes make anything like the impression produced, in spite of a less popular doctrine, by Carneades. Even he, too, was not young, probably not less than fifty-five years old; but from the fact that he lived twenty-seven years longer, and taught during most of them, we may infer that his vigour was not yet abated. He entertained the Roman youth with brilliant sceptical discourses, especially with a refutation of the current arguments for political justice, and with an implied vindication of all the Roman foreign conquests.[2] It was, in fact, the new Anaxarchus preaching to the new Alexander.[3] We are not, therefore, surprised to hear from Plutarch[4] that old Cato, the personification of the Roman *gravitas*, urged on the decision of the Senate concerning Oropus, with the object of dismissing the three professors as soon and as politely as possible from the city. Of course, our old friend, Aulus Postumius,[1] and his rivals were disappointed at this. They now had a grand opportunity of airing their Greek and displaying their *humanitas* while showing the philosophers the curiosities of the city.[2] Yet we cannot but be amused at the want of thoroughness in old Cato, in his zeal for strict Roman morals, when we reflect that in these days, while he was railing against the occasional visits of the philosophers, the comedies of Diphilus and Menander, now ten years old at Rome in Terence's versions, were spreading, not Greek theories of speculative ethics, but Greek pictures of the lowest practical morals, through Roman society. And this Terentian comedy was but a fresh outburst, somewhat more refined, of the flagrant immoralities of the Plautine stage.[3]

---

[1] Cf. the passage from Cicero quoted above.

[2] Cicero (*de repub.*, iii, 5–8) says he discoursed one day before Galba, Cato, and other dignitaries in a conservative spirit, rehearsing and enforcing all the old Platonic arguments for justice; the next day he proceeded to refute them all from his own sceptical point of view.

[3] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 132.

[4] *Cato maior*, 22.

Here was a philosophy taught openly, and in Latin, which the Athenians would not have ventured to put forward in their embassy. For Epicureanism, though a very popular religion, and represented by a fixed school with fixed traditions, was at this time never recognised by states in the Hellenistic world as of the same respectability and condition as the rest. The scholarch of this sect at Athens was now Apollodorus, surnamed the "Tyrant of the Garden" (*κηποτύραννος*), and he was certainly as eminent a man as either Critolaus or Diogenes, but no one thought of including him in the embassy, though possibly his teaching would have been far easier and more practical to many of the Roman youth.

---

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 567.

[2] Cic., *Acad. prior.*, ii, 45, for an anecdote. It is very probable that numbers pretended to enjoy the discourses of Carneades whose knowledge of Greek was quite inadequate to follow his impetuous delivery, just as numbers of people would go in London to M. Renan's Hibbert Lectures who could not understand the greater part of them. But we must remember, in mitigation of this carping conjecture, that Greek was not taught at Rome by Romans, who could not speak it out of grammars, but always by Greek-speaking masters, just as English is taught to the Russian nobility. Hence any knowledge there was of Greek at Rome was so far real that it was colloquial, and not mere linguistic anatomy.

[3] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 119 *sq.*

But while the Epicureans steadily declined all political duties, and never, so far as we know, were induced to depart from that principle, such abstention as this made them suspected and disliked in many cities, and there are statements abroad (derived, it must be added, from their enemies) that they were expelled from many Greek cities as well as from Rome.

The facts of this famous embassy show us that the heads of the other great schools had agreed to differ, but were otherwise very good friends. Carneades had spent most of his life in refuting Diogenes, and yet they travelled together to Rome, went about together, with Critolaus, to see the sights, and did not apparently indulge in mutual controversy during their visit. I fancy this would not have been the case, had the "Tyrant of the Garden" been added to their number. To suggest modern parallels: The various divisions of Protestant clergy might unite on a solemn deputation, but they would not admit a Roman Catholic priest among their number. An English clerical deputation might perhaps consent to the support of Cardinal Manning and Dr. Martineau, but they would pause and object, were a Positivist preacher requested to accompany them. And I know that in America many sects agree to co-operate that would not tolerate a Mormon elder to sit among them as a colleague.[1]

The savage bitterness of the charges made against Epicurus himself, and against his school, reminds us of the attacks made on Descartes and on Spinoza by the clerical party of the seventeenth century. No other scholarch, no other accredited sect, ever received such rude treatment from rivals or opponents.[2] But to this intolerance the uncompromising attitude of the other schools was confined.

Gradually, then, at this period, not only from the influence of Rome, which required practical lessons without subtlety, but also from internal causes, from the decay of earnest faith in speculation, of earnest faith in the aims of practical life, *eclecticism*, the creed of weary minds, laid hold of the Hellenistic world. Carneades had not only shattered all the remaining dogmatism by his brilliant polemic, but he had laid down as his highest principle *mere probability*, so that there was no reason why the researches of any set of men might not contain some approximate truth. And as the doctrines might be culled from any school, so the men who taught them might hail from any country. Hellenism had been wide enough in former generations; we now seem to approach an even wider cosmopolitanism. The successor of Carneades, Clitomachus, was born in no part of the Hellenistic world, but at Carthage, where he had taught philosophy in his own tongue.[1] He became a pupil of Carneades, whose spoken teaching he committed to writing. But Diogenes also makes this characteristic remark, that Clitomachus was a man distinguished in the three philosophies—the Academic, the Stoic, and the Peripatetic.[2] Both he and the many obscurer followers of the New Academy are said to have added nothing to its tenets, save that they laid more stress than Carneades on the positive side, on the necessity of some guide of life, while the rival schools were compelled to abate their pretensions, to surrender some of their positions, and reduce themselves to what might reasonably be accepted without any enthusiasm. In this condition the schools no longer excited suspicion at Rome. We hear of no further objections there to Greek philosophy, for a bridge of mutual concessions was being made, which would unite the once widely severed societies of dominant Rome and literary Greece.

---

[1] I once addressed a great congregation at Chautauqua, made up of at least nineteen (non-Romanist) sects, joining heartily in a service mainly culled from our *Book of Common Prayer*, and quite ready to hear any broad Christian views expounded.

[2] Cf., for example, the details given in Diogenes Laert., x, 6 f., and in Suidas, *s. v.* Ἐπίκουρος.

We may pursue for a few more pages the growth and development of the eclectic spirit before we revert to other subjects.

It may be assumed as certain that to the Romans neither the minute erudition of the Peripatetic nor the minute controversy of the Academic would afford any lasting attraction. This practical people would rather turn to those schools of life—the Epicurean and the Stoic—which had always put practice before speculation, and now, as we shall see, were quite prepared to lay aside the lesser but harder side of theory, and announce themselves as mere rules of life for men of the world. As might be expected, the better school was attractive to the highest and most cultivated Romans, who possessed, or were willing to acquire, some knowledge of Greek; while, according to Cicero, the Epicurean disciples at Rome did not delay to bring out in Latin an account of their tenets, and this book, prepared by one C. Amafinius, obtained great circulation, and converted the lower herd of the semi-educated to the lower theory.[1]

---

[1] Diog. Laert., iv, 67.

[2] He dedicated two of his writings to Romans—the poet Lucilius and the consul Censorinus. He addressed his Carthaginian fellow-countrymen in a philosophical consolation for the loss of their fatherland. He died in 110 B. C. This is, therefore, essentially a figure belonging to the epoch now under our consideration.

The historians of philosophy assert that no school was less affected by eclectic tendencies than this Epicurean school. Yet these early Latin books, which converted the multitude, and which we must ascribe to the second century B. C., were surely very narrow and inadequate accounts of a system which is as difficult and abstract as metaphysics can well be, both in the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius and in the great poem of Lucretius, who, by the way, boasts that he is the first to expound these principles in Latin poetry. The early books, no doubt, omitted all the physical and cosmological speculations, and were satisfied with the ordinary stuff which was current among the Greek idlers of the market-place. It is possible that they contained something about friendship being a pleasure in itself, but the researches of Zeller and others have proved clearly that, whatever omissions they may have permitted, none of them ever belied the theory of their great master. In fact, that school, unlike any other Greek school, never had a second master, never had a second independent thinker, who could assert himself by developing further consequences, or asserting new principles. It remained once and for all the school of Epicurus, and of Epicurus alone.

---

[1] Cicero, *Tusc. quæstt.*, iv, 3: "Itaque illius veræ elegantisque philosophiæ, quæ ducta a Socrate, nulla fere sunt aut pauca monumenta; quum interim, illis silentibus, C. Amafinius exstitit dicens: cujus libris editis commota multitudo contulit se ad eandem potissimam disciplinam, sive quod erat cognitu facillimum, sive quod invitabantur illecebris blandæ voluptatis, sive etiam, quia nihil prolatum erat melius, illud, quod erat, tenebant. Post Amafinium autem multi ejusdem muliæ rationis amuli quum scripsissent, Italiam totam occupaverunt, etc."

The case was very different with the Stoics, who from the moment of Chrysippus' death began to question some of the physical theories till then received, and gradually to approximate in their views to the Peripatetics. This is specially recorded of his immediate successor, Zeno of Tarsus, then more positively of Boethus of Sidon, the pupil and contemporary of the Diogenes of the embassy. We hear that most of them rejected the theory that the world would ultimately perish by fire, and maintained, with Aristotle's school, its eternity.

But these men do not here interest us except as links in the chain which leads to Panætius, who not only adopted their views, but went much further in his disagreement, and, though distinctly a Stoic, was nevertheless the founder of almost a new school—of that Roman Stoicism which plays so prominent a part in the history of the Empire. He came from Rhodes, and was a pupil of Diogenes at Athens. The most important part of his life was, however, spent at Rome, in the house of Scipio Æmilianus,[1] the centre of the Scipionic circle, where he trained up a number of Roman nobles to understand and to adopt his views. He seems to have taken the place of Polybius, and to have accompanied Scipio in his tour to the East (143 B. C.). He died as head of the Stoic school in Athens about 110 B. C.

---

[1] Cf. above, p. 93.

This was the man who, under the influence of the age, really modified the rigid tenets of his sect to make it the practical rule of life for statesmen, politicians, magnates, that had no time to sit all day and dispute, but who required something better than the effete polytheism to give them dignity in their leisure and steadfastness in the day of trial. He denied, indeed, with his teachers, the eternity of the world, but also with the Epicureans the immortality of the soul, as we know from Cicero's refutation. His main work, however, was the teaching of practical duties—those perfections falling short of the Stoic perfection—which Cicero reproduces in his treatise *de officiis.* In theology he, like Polybius, regarded the traditional gods as a mere political convenience, and he ridiculed the divines, in the style of Carneades.

With the pupils of Panætius begins the long roll of Roman Stoics: Lælius; his son-in-law, Q. Mucius Scævola; Q. Tubero, the nephew of Scipio, to whom Panætius dedicated his work on *Duties;* Rutilius Rufus, the just administrator of Asia, whom the *publicani* exiled for his protection of the Asiatic province from their extortions; and many others to whom Cicero refers. But as yet I do not wish to cross the threshold of the first century B. C.; so I forbear.

Here then, after all the dissolute and disintegrating influences of Hellenism—its *comœdia palliata*, its parasites, its panders, its minions, its chicanery, its mendacity—had produced their terrible effect, came an antidote which, above all the human influences we know, purified and ennobled the world. It affected, unfortunately, only the higher classes[1] at Rome; and even among them, as among any of the lower classes that speculated at all, it had as a dangerous rival that cheap and vulgar Epicureanism which puffs up common natures with the belief that their trivial and coarse reflections have some philosophic basis, and can be defended with subtle arguments.

But among the best of the Romans Hellenism produced a type seldom excelled in the world's history; a type as superior to the old Roman model as the nobleman is to the burgher in most countries; a type we see in Rutilius Rufus, as compared with the elder Cato. Whoever reads Plutarch's *Life* of this latter person will see that he was in many senses a worthy man, an able man, an educated man; but he was no gentleman. Rutilius conducted his life, and performed his public duties, as Cato had done, with a purity exceptional in any society; but when sentenced to exile by a decision so flagrant that it convulsed the public mind with disgust, he bore not only his misfortune with refined calmness and cheerfulness, but spent a happy and honoured retirement at Smyrna, where Cato would have been miserable, and offensive to the provincials. Everything we hear of Rutilius shows not only his high principle, but his perfect temper and his large culture. It is deeply to be regretted that his *Memoirs* are not preserved. We know him through the many allusions of Cicero, Seneca, and others.[1] It was in this way that Hellenistic philosophy made itself a home in Italy, and acquired pupils who in the next generation became masters in their way, and showed in Cicero and Lucretius no mean rivals of the contemporary Greek.

---

[1] And when I say "higher classes," I do not confine the word to the conservative patricians. Tiberius Gracchus, whose whole education had been entrusted to Greeks (as Cicero tells us), was advised, and probably incited, in his radical schemes by Blossius of Cumæ, no doubt a teacher very inferior to Panætius, but a far more dangerous enthusiast. This man left Rome after Tiberius' death, and joined Aristonicus in his war against Rome for the kingdom of Pergamum. When the pretender was defeated, Blossius committed suicide. There may have been a deep anti-Roman feeling stimulating this philosopher's theories of political reform.

Lucretius is so essentially a Roman figure, and his poem so Roman a poem, that I will not turn aside to criticise it at any length. But as the author himself tells us, his philosophical masters were Democritus and Epicurus, his poetical masters Empedocles and Ennius, so that he claims originality only for having been the first to treat this Greek system of philosophy in Latin—perhaps in Latin poetry. For here his claim is made doubtful by what Cicero says of Amafinius, and the vulgar herd who reproduced Epicurus in Latin prose. Yet, still, there is far more originality in Lucretius than he claims for himself. In the first place, he recasts the ostentatiously slipshod writing of Epicurus into a noble poem, and for his model he selects, not the fashionable Alexandrian poets, as his contemporary Catullus did, but a famous old master of real Hellenic purity.[2] And to reproduce the effect of this old epic speech, he goes back to the archaic Ennius, and resuscitates forms which were antiquated and forgotten by the fashionable literati of his day. This bold attempt, executed with undoubted genius, was perhaps too original to meet with general favour from the advocates of the new school, though it influenced the best of them, Catullus and Virgil, very considerably. But however little he may have been appreciated by his compeers, posterity has recognised the first great success in reproducing Greek thought and Greek artistic style in a Roman dress. The poem of Lucretius stands beside the prose of Epicurus, superior in literary form as is the poetry of Virgil beside that of Apollonius Rhodius, or the English Bible beside the Greek. The Romans were, indeed, imitators and pupils; but what pupils![1]

---

[1] Cf. Zeller, *op. cit.*, p. 536.

[2] Cf. on Empedocles, my *Classical Greek Literature*, Vol. I, pp. 124 *sq*.

---

[1] The attempt of Pub. Nigidius Figulus, whom Mommsen rates so extravagantly (*Römische Geschichte*, Vol. III, p. 573), chiefly on the authority, too, of that Cicero whom he derides and despises, I shall consider in connection with the new Pythagoreanism of Alexandria and the East at this period—the most curious of all the philosophic developments of the century before Augustus.

CHAPTER VI

THE GENERAL REACTION OF HELLENISM UPON ROME

I have chosen for our first and most serious consideration the settlement of Greek philosophy at Rome, because there was no purer or more distinctly Greek product, or one which kept its individual character and language so long. Till the poem of Lucretius and the works of Cicero, we may say that nothing in Latin worth reading existed on the subject. Whoever wanted to study philosophy, therefore, down to that time (60 B. C.) studied it in Greek. Nearly the same thing may be said of the arts of architecture, painting, and sculpture. There were, indeed, distinctly Roman features in architecture, but they were mere matters of building, and whatever was done in the way of design, in the way of adding beauty to strength, was done wholly under the advice and direction of the Greeks.

The subservience to Hellenism in the way of internal household ornament was even more complete. No painting or sculpture from native artists would now be tolerated at Rome. Extravagant prices were paid for statues and pictures from Greece, also for silver plate and for Greek marbles, though there were precious quarries lying idle in Italy.[1] The prices then paid for old silver—twenty to thirty times the price of the metal—rival those lavished in our own day on "Queen Anne" plate. And along with the ornaments of the house, the proper serving of the house, especially the more delicate departments—the cooking of state dinners, the attendance upon guests, the care of the great man's intimate comforts—could only be done fashionably by Greek slaves. The outburst of Hellenistic fashions of this sort at Rome must have far exceeded the outburst of French fashions in England after the peace of 1815, when she, with all her great wealth and European prestige, had been practically excluded from the progress of material civilisation in France for a whole generation, and suddenly awoke to the fact that in many respects she was still rude and barbarous.

---

[1] Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxxiv, 36,37; Livy, xxxix, 6,7; and Professor Dill, *Roman Society from Nero, etc.*, p. 67.

But, of course, these lower sides of Hellenism had no more potent effect in civilising Rome than the employing of French cooks and valets, and the purchase of French ornaments and furniture, had in improving our grandfathers. Much more serious was the acknowledged supremacy of the Greeks in literature of all kinds, and still more their insistence that this superiority depended mainly upon a careful system of intellectual education. A self-taught man—*autodidaktos*—or even the man who learned late—*opsimathes*—was in the Greek world always considered a man of inferior breeding, and wanting in real refinement. This is the point where Polybius, after his seventeen years' experience of Roman life, finds the capital flaw in the conduct of public affairs. In every Hellenistic state, he says, nothing engrosses the attention of legislators more than the question of education, whereas at Rome a most moral and serious government leaves the training of the young to the mistakes and hazards of private enterprise.

That this was a grave blunder as regards the lower classes is probably true. The Roman mob during the next few generations showed all the vices and violences of an ignorant populace entrusted with the affairs of a mighty empire. If, therefore, the almost universal assumption be really true, that the mob of any nation can be educated out of passion and folly into a reasonable crowd, then the Senate was liable to a crime of omission which brought upon that government terrible punishment. But as regards the upper classes, whose education the Senate did no doubt carefully consider, the Roman theory held that home education was the only education worth having, and that the unpaid interest taken in the young by parents and parents' friends was the proper influence to be brought upon the rising generation. So long as the requirements of the day were small, and consisted chiefly of practical good sense in the management of household affairs or civic duties, this theory did not show its weakness. But when Rome grew from a city controlling Italy to an empire directing the world, such men as Æmilius Paullus saw plainly that they must do something more to fit their children for the splendid position they had themselves attained, and so they were obliged to keep foreign teachers of literature and art in their houses as private tutors.

The highest class of these private tutors was that of the philosophers, whom we have considered, and while the State set itself against their public establishment, great men in the State openly encouraged them and kept them in their houses. Cicero says that he treated his literary slave Dionysius better than Scipio treated Panætius; and the jibe of Lucilius, that his horse and groom were worth more to him than his philosopher, seems to corroborate this.[1] But still, so far as philosophy was concerned, the Romans could hardly say anything reasonable to depreciate the Greeks. No Roman of that day could produce anything beyond the obscure and probably contemptible Epicureanism of Ennius and Amafinius.

As regards literature, however, at the close of the second century B. C. a change was visible which announced the new and marvellous results of the next. The Romans had begun with translating as best they could Greek masterpieces, then had attempted national poems like that of Nævius. But, according as the best judges began to appreciate the Greek originals and use them with greater ease, these early versions were despised and became ridiculous. We have before us only one large example of this change in critical taste—the versions of Greek comedy we find in Plautus and Terence respectively. The refined diction of Terence shows us what was the taste of the younger Scipio and Lælius, and what they required in a translation as compared with the rude attempts of the older days. Still more remarkable is it that this brilliant success was not popular with the masses, and that it led to no further attempts in the same direction. Terence, far the most perfect, is also the last in the long series of early Roman translations from the Greek.

Nor are the causes far to seek. In the first place, this clearer and deeper comprehension of the great originals led to two conclusions: that the grace and beauty of Greek poetry were unattainable in Latin, and that they were in any case far above the enjoyment of the masses. In the second place, the refinement attained in the style of Terence suggested that the Latin tongue had, after all, a future of its own, and was destined to pursue an independent course in literature. This latter expectation was realised by the rise of Lucilius, the first original Latin poet, whose medleys on life and manners were popular not only within the circle which patronised and supported Terence, but among that far larger public that could not or would not appreciate the refined vices of Menander in Roman speech. The attempt of Nævius to create a national poetry had failed, for the time was not ripe. The attempt of Lucilius succeeded, as the long line of Roman satirists abundantly proves.

---

[1] Cf. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. II, p. 425.

But the reaction in prose literature is still more remarkable. There were circulated during these days at least two specimens of Latin prose-writing which were essentially Roman, and yet in no wise lacking either force or purity. These were the speeches of Caius Gracchus—of which fragments remain—and the letters of his mother, Cornelia. Such books showed that Latin eloquence had powers of its own, and need not build entirely upon Greek rhetoric. Accordingly, Crassus and Antonius, of whom we shall speak again in connection with Cicero, were distinctly national, and founded the great school of Latin eloquence suggested by, but not derived from, its Greek sister. There is even abroad a spirit of antagonism to Greek rhetoric, as a school of subtlety and of unpractical discussion—a spirit manifested not only in the traditions of these early orators, but in the edict against the Latin pedants who imitated the Greek professors (92 B. C.).

Accordingly, even in grammar, which Dionysius Thrax had been teaching at his school in Rome since 107 B. C., there arose a Latin school, of which the founder was L. Ælius Stilo, who taught Roman youths gratuitously, as the great jurisconsults did, by way of advice as a friend, and who based his lessons in Latin grammar and style upon a study of the older Latin models. The fashion of writing for posterity in Greek began to wane, and a Roman literature, solid and founded upon rational study, supplanted the exotic growths so long fashionable.

Thus even in letters Roman culture began to take its place beside Greek, and the whole civilised world was divided into those who knew Greek letters and those who knew Roman only. There was no antagonism in spirit between them, for the Romans never ceased to venerate Greek letters or to prize a knowledge of that language. But, of course, there were great domains in the West beyond the influence of the most western Greeks, even of Massilia, where the first higher civilisation was introduced with the Roman legions and traders, and where culture assumed permanently a Latin form. In the East, though the Romans asserted themselves as conquerors, they always condescended to use Greek, and there were prætors proud to give their decisions at Roman assize courts in that language. Hence there might have been fairly anticipated a peaceful development of both under the Roman sway, and a long period of prosperity for Hellenism of the material and moral, though not of the political, kind. The injustice of governors and traders who presumed on Roman domination was, indeed, a pressing evil. Yet the development of higher culture at Rome, the spread of Stoic philosophy, the occurrence of men like the Gracchi, the Scipios, and Rutilius point to an improvement, not only in the rulers, but in public opinion, and a growing disposition to hear the complaints of provincials, and to redress them.

But the great internal troubles of Rome supervened, and cast into the shade all this higher development. While the select few were really advancing on nobler paths, the bulk of the nobility and the populace were involved not only in the Gracchan troubles, and by and by in the shocking violences of Cinna and Marius, but also in the Jugurthan intrigues, in the great Cimbric tumult, and then in the revolt of the Italian subjects. So it is that wars and rumours of wars fill the pages of the historian, to the exclusion of social and spiritual life. And so it is with the Greek world, now under the domination of Rome. Here, too, the days of reform in provincial administration were too long delayed, and the great catastrophe of a new, unsuccessful revolt came upon the larger and better portion of Hellenism. When Mithradates, an oriental despot merely varnished with culture, created his kingdom upon the shores of the Euxine, and came into collision with the Romans, the cruelties and oppressions of the *publicani* and prætors had been such that the great body of Greeks in Asia and Hellas rose with him against their tormentors.

The nations which are our special study thus suddenly move again into the foreground of history, and the events in Greece and Asia Minor become suddenly as important as the annals of the capital. This prominence was, however, purchased at a terrible cost; the reprisals and confiscations of the conquerors exhausted the Hellenistic world for generations. Far worse, too, than even this was the renewed estrangement between Greek and Roman, which the events of the last fifty years had been tending to efface. The friends of the 100,000 Italians massacred in Asia and at Delos must have made up their minds that, after all, there was a national antipathy which nothing could allay; they must have felt that henceforth the only safe policy was to cripple completely an empire of subjects who, after all the favour bestowed in the way of internal liberty and public respect, were ready to join any barbarian invader against the Republic of the West.

The wars of Mithradates with Sulla, and then with Lucullus, are a matter of ordinary Roman history, here again profoundly interesting because we have, besides Appian, the inestimable Plutarch, whose lives of Sulla, Sertorius, and Lucullus lead up to those of Pompey and Cæsar. What we have to do is to search the events of this momentous epoch for evidences of the progress or decay of Hellenism in the world.

And first of all let me turn to a very outlying province, which might easily be mistaken for a province of Hellenism in the technical sense, but which is really of quite a different type; I mean the civilisation which the generals of Mithradates found and protected on the north of the Euxine, in the Crimean kingdom.

This outlying portion of the Greek world had been planted centuries before by the Milesians and Megarians for the purpose of trade, and a number of cities had been built along the strait which forms the outlet of the Sea of Asov. The country on the east side of that sea was productive in corn and cattle. The shallow sea was peculiarly rich in fish, and with the gradual rise of population in Greece, and of luxury in Greek cities, this Cimmerian Bosphorus obtained an unlimited market for wheat, salt-fish, and hides. So its wealth and importance increased, and though always threatened by the nomad hordes of the North, the Greeks managed, either by building strong cities, and walls across the isthmus, or by treaties and intermarriages with barbarians, to maintain themselves in wealth and culture. There were important free cities, and there were despots[1] ruling over the inner country. One of these despots, Leucon, is mentioned by Demosthenes[2] as having obtained for himself and his heirs the freedom of the city of Athens, in requital for the gifts of corn he had bestowed on the Athenians in a time of scarcity. The tombs of these despots, which were still unrifled in the ninteeenth century, have yielded treasures to the Museum of Kertch (sacked in the Crimean war by the French and English) and to that of St. Petersburg, which have been reproduced in splendid coloured plates by the Russian government.[3] These ornaments not only show that large quantities of gold must have been brought to these Greek cities from the Ural, but that they possessed artists of the highest quality to work it into rich and beautiful designs.

The Macedonian conquest of the East seriously affected the prosperity of the Crimean Greeks. The decay of Greece, not to mention the rival wealth of Egypt, spoiled their long-established market. When the political centre of gravity moved westward, Africa and outer Spain could supply both wheat and salt-fish better and cheaper than the Sea of Asov; for the Mediterranean is not comparable to the Atlantic fish, and how could the climate of Scythia compete with Sicily and Africa—a climate where it was possible, indeed, to grow vines, but necessary to cover them completely with earth every winter;[1] a climate, moreover, where a great battle could be fought and won upon the ice, a feat which one of Mithradates' generals actually performed?[2]

---

[1] *ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ τύραννοι καίπερ οἱ πλείους ἐπιεικεῖς γεγονότες* (Strabo, vii, 4. 4).

[2] *In Leptinem*, 30-40.

[3] *Antiquités du Bosphore cimmérien*, giving the remains found in the tumulus of Koul-Oba, near Kertch.

The whole progress of Alexander's conquest neglected the Cimmerian Bosphorus and its Chersonese as of no importance, and this decay of prominence meant, of course, decay of power, and hence growing inability to meet or resist the demands of the nomads, who expected the southerners to cultivate the land, but to pay a heavy tax or blackmail for this privilege. And the amount was determined by the strength and rapacity of those who demanded it. So there was repeated a history like that of Byzantium, which I have already told in my *Greek Life and Thought*.[3]

The details of this Crimean history, and the results in the time of Mithradates, which were till recently known only from Strabo's summary,[4] are now confirmed and enlarged by the long inscription in honour of Diophantus,[5] which tells us that he was a Sinopean, solicited by the king to undertake this command, and that he repeatedly won victories for the king over the Scythians, hitherto deemed invincible.[1]

---

[1] Strabo, ii, 1. 16. The practice still exists in Hungary, and I suppose elsewhere in those parts of Europe which have a severe winter.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Pp. 348 *sq.*

[4] vii, 4. 17, probably taken from Posidonius.

[5] Which may be most easily read in Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, 2d ed., No. 326 (1st ed., No. 252); Michel's *Recueil*, No. 338.

The generals of Mithradates brought a small army of disciplined troops to the aid of the distressed Greeks, whose last king, Parisades, consented to pay a tribute of 200 talents and a vast amount of wheat to the Pontic sovran on condition of being saved from the Scythian marauders. The battles which took place were famous as demonstrating again the absolute superiority of discipline and of better arms over any numerical majority of barbarians. Diophantus with 6,000 men defeated and almost annihilated a host alleged to be 50,000 strong. I am always suspicious of the numbers in ancient histories; but the general statement is to be accepted, and is all the more interesting as we now attribute our superiority over Zulus and Arabs wholly to our arms of precision, which are generally different *in kind* from those of savages, and not, as the arms of Diophantus' army,[2] merely better swords, shields, spears, and discipline. No doubt the field artillery must have been even more important then than it is now, and must have astonished the Scythians as it did the Thracians when attacked by Alexander.[1]

---

[1] *τοὺς ἀνυποστάτους δοκοῦντας εἶμεν Σκύθας τρεψάμενος, πρῶτον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπόησε βασιλέα Μιθραδάταν Εὐπάτορα τρόπαιον ἀναστᾶσαι κτλ.* The titles of the city authorities at Chersonesus, where the inscription was set up, also inform us that, in spite of titular *kings*, who were no more real kings than the *rex sacrificulus* at Rome, the constitution was democratic, and manifestly modelled from the old arrangements of Megara, which had founded Heraclea, the immediate mother-city of Chersonesus. Even the *kings* as religious officers, chosen by lot, occur in old inscriptions of Megara, as well as at Chios; and the eponymous officer at Calymnæ was called *μόναρχος* down to the first century A. D. (cf. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (*BCH.*), Vol. VIII, p. 30; Vol. IX, p. 286).

[2] Cf. Strabo, xvi, 1. 53, for another example: "Petronius, when the Alexandrian mob of so many myriads set upon him, throwing stones, with his escort of soldiers held his ground, and having killed some of them, quieted the rest."

The protection of Mithradates lasted but a short time, and was exchanged for that of the Romans, who during all the century before us were occupied with domestic struggles, and were in any case culpably lax and careless about their outlying subjects. So, then, the overthrow of the Pontic power was probably a heavy blow to these cities.[2] But the point to be noticed is this, that they never had formed part of any Hellenistic kingdom, nor had they been directly affected by any of the new influences which so deeply modified Hellenedom. Hence we shall find them under the Roman Empire a curious remnant of old-world culture, differing *toto cœlo* from the newer settlements of Syria and inner Asia. But we must leave our further consideration of them till they again emerge in the pages of Dion Chrysostom.[3] The somewhat similar position of Massilia in the West will be considered in the sequel (p. 228).

As regards the regions of real Hellenism, Egypt was altogether unconcerned in the Mithradatic struggles, and firmly but politely refused to aid Sulla when he sent his lieutenant, the famous Lucullus, to beg for ships. The young king (Ptolemy Lathyrus) entertained the Roman with great splendour, but sent him away without help.[1] The Syrian cities were now under Tigranes, whom they hated; but Tigranes was not implicated in the first war of his brother-in-law. It was, in fact, only Asia Minor and Greece (apart from the Crimean Greeks) which appeared in the struggle with Sulla.

---

[1] Cf. my *Alexander's Empire*, chap. 1.

[2] There is a Latin inscription as late as the reign of Domitian lauding Ti. Plaut. Silv. Ælianus, legate *pro prætore*, of Mœsia (58–69 A. D.), for saving the town of Cherson from a siege by a Scythian king, and so enabling a large quantity of corn to be sent to Rome (cf. *CIL.*, III, 781, and *BCH.*, Vol. IX, p. 275).

[3] Below, chap. 16. Note there Pliny's letter on the subject.

Here we may note first of all the greater predominance and importance of Asia. The primacy seems reversed, for whereas, of old, Ionia had been long insignificant as compared with the European states, now there is hardly any account taken of the latter except Athens, the Asiatic cities showing not only a far larger number of inhabitants, especially foreigners, but also greater independence in their policy. Though the majority join the invader and massacre the hated Italic residents, several isolated members of this great society of towns hold firm in their allegiance to Rome, and even withstand the victorious armies of the Cappadocian. Of course, there were many more who turned upon the king as soon as they found the Roman power was likely to overcome him. Of this we have an interesting case in the Ephesians, whose decree of recantation and of loyalty to the Romans may now be read at Oxford.[2] Far more honest was the Carian League, headed by the town of Stratoniceia, which from the first boldly resisted the Pontic invader, and in consequence received great rewards and favours from Sulla. There has been recently found at Lagina, which represents the site of Stratoniceia, a now famous inscription containing a letter from Sulla, and a *senatus consultum*, which the dictator got passed in the year 80 B. C., confirming to the inhabitants all the privileges he had bestowed upon them —remission of taxes, increase of territory, right of priority in consulting the Senate, and, above all, the right of asylum for their famous temple of Hecate, which had been acknowledged generally by the Greek world.[1]

---

[1] Cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 422.

[2] Cf. Hicks, *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 1st ed., No. 205; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 1st ed., No. 329; Michel, *Recueil*, No. 496.

We can easily understand this Philo-Romanism, even apart from long-sighted policy, such as we might have anticipated in the Rhodians. For oppressive as were the Italians, the Pontic king was worse,[2] and was distinctly a barbarian, in spite of his knowledge of Greek, his Greek mercenary generals, and his fine promises to the Greek world. Appian, in describing his character,[3] says he studied Greek culture, honoured Greek temples, and was fond of Greek music. He was also a collector of antique works of art;[4] but his harem and his utter dependence on eunuchs, which indeed was the main cause of his final overthrow, show his oriental side plainly enough. His armies, too, though commanded by Greeks, were distinctly armies of barbarians. If the Romans had, indeed, been expelled from the East, the cause of Hellenism would certainly have suffered more even than it did from their exactions. For the best Romans were already, or were daily becoming, real members of the Hellenistic world; and we can see from the policy of Sulla, Lucullus, and Pompey how even the manifest dislike and treachery of the Greeks, and their enthusiastic reception of the murderer of 100,000 Italians, had not unsettled the fixed idea that Greeks were one thing, and all the rest of the East another; that Greeks had the monopoly of culture, and that the rest were only fit to serve them and the Romans.

---

[1] *BCH.*, Vol. IX, pp. 437 *sq.* To this document I shall revert, p. 179.

[2] His uprooting and removal of the Chians—a ruthless piece of cruelty—is to be paralleled by the proceeding of Tigranes, mentioned by Strabo (xi, 14. 15), when he was founding his new capital, Tigranocerta, from twelve Greek cities emptied for the purpose. This policy was frustrated in time by the conquest of Lucullus. Cf. Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 14, 21, 26, 29, 32.

[3] *Mith.*, 112, and M. Th. Reinach's monograph on this king.

[4] *Mith.*, 115 *sub fin.* Strabo also (x, 4. 10), in a digression upon his own ancestors and their relations to Cnossus in Crete, speaks of the intimacy of both Mithradates Euergetes and his son Eupator with the Greek family of Dorylaus, professor of military tactics. The younger Dorylaus (nephew of the elder) was brought up as an intimate with the great Pontic king.

The gross ingratitude of the Greeks of Asia, who, in spite of this profoundly sentimental, theoretical admiration, took practical extortion and cruelty so much to heart as to massacre their admirers wholesale, was not, indeed, forgotten by the Romans;[1] but in the moment of victory the cynical and relentless Sulla only punished them with an immense war idemnity, and his successor, Lucullus, sought to save them from the financial ruin which threatened them in consequence. The wealth of the free cities in Asia Minor seems to have been so great that not even the levying of five years' taxes in advance would have ruined them, had they not been induced or constrained to borrow from the Roman speculators, who treated them in the same way as Verres afterwards treated the Sicilians. The usurers took care to make all escape from their clutches impossible.

---

[1] What was even worse, the massacre and loss of property caused a financial crisis at Rome—an important fact omitted in the modern histories. Cf. Cicero, *pro lege Man.*, 19: "Nam tum, quum in Asia res magnas permulti amiserant, scimus Romæ, solutione impedita, fidem concidisse."

We hear of no parallel exactions from Greece, though the resistance of Athens and the Piræus was to Sulla a far more serious offence than the mere massacre of Italian traders. Indeed, Sulla specially gives up, in his argument with Mithradates,[1] the defence of M. Aquillius' character, and concedes that his greed for gold and dishonesty in selling provinces had been an important factor in the war. This admission would, of course, apply also to the inferior extortioners who infested the province of Asia.

But Athens and the Piræus really blocked the way, and made Sulla run imminent risk of losing everything; and though the latter was held by a foreign army under a foreign general, Archelaus, Athens had put itself under the direction of a mere impostor, and permitted him, while bringing the city into great misery by his selfish cruelty, to insult and delay Sulla.

The story of this Aristion is very interesting, as it shows us a prominent example of the curious class so widespread in that age—I mean the impostor in philosophy. The story is copied by Athenæus from Posidonius, who was a contemporary authority, and there is no reason to question the main facts.[2] This Aristion was son, by an

---

[1] Appian, *Mith.*, 156, 157, no doubt taken from Sulla's own *Memoirs*.

[2] Athenæus, 211 E *sq.* Appian (*Mith.*, 28) differs in many details. Athenæus calls him Athenion, but is wrong, as is proved not only by other writers, but by the existence of a coin of Athens with the names of Mithradates and Aristion on it. It is reproduced in Duruy's *History of Rome*, Vol. II, pp. 660, 661. Plutarch has the name right, *Reip. gub. præc.*, 14. On a set of coins found in 1881 at Athens, which had evidently been buried at the moment of Sulla's invasion, we find a gold coin (which is unusual, as only military conquerors seem to have made them) not only with Μιθραδατης Βασιλευς, and under it Aristion (as his satrap), but even with Mithradates' "cognisance," a winged Pegasus drinking at a fountain (cf.

Egyptian slave mother, of an Athenian who was a long time a pupil in the Peripatetic school of Erymneus (scholarch about 110 B. C.). He succeeded to the goods of his father, who had apparently no legitimate son, and so he got himself enrolled as an Athenian citizen. We may imagine that in these decayed times any man with some money, who could show an Athenian father, found little difficulty in accomplishing this. He then married a pretty slave girl, and adopted the profession of sophist, touting for youths who wanted education.[1] So, having practised both at Messene and at Larissa in Thessaly, and having made a good deal of money, he came to Athens. Such wandering sophists were to be found all over the world. Thus a few years later, during the war of Lucullus with Tigranes, we hear of one, Amphicrates, who, flying from Athens, arrived at Seleucia on the Tigris, where the people besought him, as being an Athenian, to establish himself as a sophist. But he said he would not be a triton among minnows,[2] and went off to the queen of Tigranes, Mithradates' sister, where he obtained enough

---

Revue des études grecques, Vol. II, p. 145). In an able article on Athens and Mithradates suggested by this evidence, R. Weil (*Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VI, pp. 314 *sq.*) argues that the story in the text, being derived from the Stoic Posidonius, is coloured by the strong prejudices of scholastic rivalry. Indeed, the schools now took opposite sides, the Academics and Stoics holding with the Romans, the Peripatetics with the Pontic king. It may have been that Posidonius calls the man Athenion to assert his illegitimacy, by which name he would have been known but for his success in foisting himself on an Athenian tribe. The details must, therefore, be accepted with hesitation. M. Th. Reinach's admirable monograph, ***Mithradates***, now supersedes all earlier studies.

[1] *γήμας τε παιδισκάριον εὔμορφον πρὸς τὸ σοφιστεύειν ὥρμησε μειράκια σχολαστικὰ θηρεύων.*

[2] Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 22. His joke was really much more insolent, seeing how great a city this Seleucia was: *ὡς οὐδὲ λεκάνη δελφῖνα χωροίη.*

influence to be suspected of cabals with the Greeks of Parthia, and was put to death.

In the same way Aristion was ambitious of figuring at court, and got himself nominated as ambassador from Athens to Mithradates. Pontus and Cappadocia had old relations with Athens. Sinope and Amisus especially, close to Eupatoria, the royal residence, were full of old Attic settlers since the days of Pericles, and both religious rites and names record this connection. It seems, however, that the moving force which drove Athens to take this disastrous step was anger and jealousy at the Roman and Phœnician traders, who had settled in crowds at Delos, and had ousted the Athenian citizens, to whom the island now formally belonged, from all their business. No doubt the Italians were not only overreaching, but self-asserting, and rode roughshod over the rights of the Delian merchants.

"Aristion was sent out to Pontus, and here he was eminently successful, so that he sent letters to Athens telling of his great influence with the king, and that he would not only obtain remission of their encumbrances and a reconciliation of parties, but that they would recover their democracy, and receive great presents both as individuals and for their state. So the Athenians were greatly excited at this hope, and at the chance of getting rid of the Roman supremacy.

"No sooner had Mithradates overrun Asia than Aristion set out for Athens, and was sent for to Carystos by the people with warships and great pomp. The whole city came out to meet him, like a new Alcibiades, and so this side-wind citizen excited the astonishment of all that beheld him, entering Athens in a gorgeous litter with purple hangings—a creature who had never seen such a thing at Athens in his life before, for not even a Roman would assume such airs in Attica. Every man, woman, and child ran together to witness his arrival, and naturally expected great things from Mithradates, seeing that this pauper, Aristion, who had made his living by 'subscription lectures,' was now set up by him in lavish luxury. The Dionysiac artists[1] also came out to meet him, inviting him as the envoy of the new Dionysus—so the Pontic king was called by Asiatic flatterers—to all their feasts and privileges. So the man who had gone out from a hired lodging was led back to the mansion of the rich Diæus (who owned revenues at Delos), which was adorned with carpets, paintings, statues, and silver plate. From this he issued forth in splendid robes, wearing a ring with the head of Mithradates, preceded and followed by a numerous escort. In the *temenos* of the artists sacrifices and libations were offered in honour of his advent. People waited in crowds next day to see him pass, and all went to the public assembly without summons in the hope of hearing him. At last he appeared with a volunteer guard about him, everyone being anxious even to touch the hem of his garment." He then ascended the rostra prepared for the Roman governors, and made a pompous speech, of which Posidonius gives us his own version.[2] He represents him as having painted the king's power in glowing language, how all Hither Asia obeyed him, how the Roman generals, even Manius Aquillius, the conqueror of Sicily

---

[1] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 383.

[2] Athenæus, pp. 212 *sq.*

(in the Slave War), was following him in chains, and the rest of the so-called Romans in Asia either were embracing the knees of the gods as suppliants, or had got rid of their togas and were now proclaiming their former nationalities—a very graphic feature, and no doubt in accordance with the facts.[1] So Thrace and Macedonia are sending him troops, and both the Italian insurgents and Carthage (!) are asking him to join in destroying Rome. "Let us then no longer tolerate the anarchy inflicted upon us by the Roman Senate, while they deliberate how we are to be governed, and let us not bear to see the temples shut up, the gymnasia unkept, the theatre without assemblies, the courts silent, the Pnyx taken from the people, the solemn processions disused, and the schools of the philosophers deserted."

If this language was used, it was surely intended to be understood in a loose sense. Athens had, upon the whole, been better treated by the Romans than any other Greek city. Apparently she alone retained the privilege of coining silver, and received the proconsul attended by one lictor only. But we can see some colour in Aristion's statement, when we consider that the franchise had been restricted, the Eleusinia interfered with, and a supervision over the schools exercised.[2] However, the sham philosopher gained his object, was forthwith declared *military strategus*,[3] and thereupon began a systematic persecution of all the wealthier people, who naturally adhered to the Roman interest. Then were re-enacted such scenes as have already been noticed in my former volume in connection with the revolt of the Achæan League.[1] The property of the suspects was seized; they were imprisoned and put to death without fair trial; the gates were guarded, and no citizen permitted to escape; even the country was scoured for stray fugitives, and a strict "curfew" was established in the city. Aristion sent his lieutenant, Apellicon of Teos, to seize the riches of Delos, where this other Peripatetic was defeated by the Roman guard and most of his men killed.[2] Here, as in the province of Asia, the Pontic king ordered a great massacre of Italians, and twenty thousand are said to have lost their lives.

---

[1] *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ μεταμφιεσάμενοι τετράγωνα ἱμάτια τὰς ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρίδας πάλιν ὀνομάζουσι.* Even the famous Rutilius Rufus, an ostentatious Stoic, was glad to drop his toga and assume a Greek dress for a disguise. He was living in exile at Smyrna.

[2] Cf. R. Weil in *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VI, p. 315.

[3] In these later times it appears that, in imitation of the Roman consuls, the chief power at Athens had been vested in two *strategi*,

So the wretched Athenians were implicated in the great war; they were compelled to stand a disastrous siege; all their fair suburbs were devastated by Sulla in his search for siege materials and provisions; the Piræus was ultimately dismantled and reduced to an open fishing-village,[3] and the city itself was sacked with great slaughter

---

one ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα, the other ἐπὶ τὴν διοίκησιν. The name of Philo appears beside that of Aristion on one of the coins. Ultimately, the former *strategus* gave the name to the year, and became the sole chief magistrate (cf. Th. Reinach in the *Revue des études grecques*, Vol. I, pp. 169 *sq.*). We have his marble arm-chair remaining in the theatre at Athens.

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 452.

[2] Our information concerning the contact of Greeks and Romans at Delos is so new, and so instructive, that I shall revert to it more fully at the end of this chapter.

[3] The celebrated arsenal of Philo, of which the remains have lately been excavated and the plan recovered, was burnt down by Sulla. Its site has been recently excavated, and the whole plan restored with admirable sagacity by W. Dörpfeld, with plans and drawings (cf. *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VI).

and rapine. The descriptions given of these events would make us believe that Athens was almost destroyed, and recovered some dignity only under the patronage of Hadrian. But this language is exaggerated, as we may infer from the allusions of Cicero a few years later. Thus Fimbria is said to have destroyed Ilium more completely than Agamemnon did, because the Ilians wanted to side with Sulla. But this too is beyond the truth. Still we may be sure that Sulla's terrible war in Attica and his two campaigns in Bœotia inflicted irreparable harm on continental Greece. The temples were plundered;[1] the inhabitants conscribed; the country ruthlessly taxed; and though the carrying away of statues to Rome was not yet practised on a large scale, many valuable collections were taken as booty. Sulla seized as his private share the library of Apellicon of Teos, a collector of old documents and early copies of authors, who had (it was said) brought the original manuscripts of Aristotle and Theophrastus[2] from Scepsis, where they had long mouldered in a cellar. The transference of this important library to Rome is noted as a special moment in the higher education of that city.

As regards the rest of Greece we hear nothing, save that there had been at Dyme (in Achæa) a democratic revolution of the usual kind against the people of property, to whom the Romans entrusted the management of affairs.

---

[1] Plutarch, *Sulla*, 12.

[2] This story, told by Strabo (xiii, 1. 54), has excited much controversy. Apellicon was also accused by Posidonius of borrowing old state documents, and sending back copies, for which he was threatened with prosecution at Athens (Athenæus, 214 E *sq.*). For my own part, I believe what Strabo tells us about these adventures of Aristotle's books.

This and the other disturbances in Greece were put down by Sulla, or whoever the Roman governor was, on fixed principles. They executed ringleaders, and took care to exclude from the franchise all the people who had no property. Sulla was a cynic in the modern sense, and, in spite of all the trouble the Greeks gave him, kept them about him constantly to amuse him. It may be said of almost all the other eminent Romans of these days—Lucullus, Pompey, Crassus—that they regarded it as a sort of indispensable luxury to have a Greek philosopher in their retinue and an inmate of their house. And in this they were probably imitating the Hellenistic kings, who had adopted the same fashion, especially in new and outlying portions of the Hellenistic world.

The campaigns of Lucullus and Pompey were rather beyond the bounds of Hellenism, but not beyond the regions where many isolated cities were settled among orientals or barbarians. We have already taken notice (p. 119) of the violences done to these cities both by Mithradates and Tigranes. We have also noticed the harsh treatment the Greek towns received from the later Maccabee sovrans.[1]

All these separate cities through Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine received a new life, and many dated a new era, from the victory of the Romans. Sulla, Lucullus, and Pompey all carried out the old policy of favouring the isolated cities, and of securing their communal privileges in the midst of the territories of the various dynasts still left in control of native affairs. They would willingly have abolished all or most of these regents, but, to their astonishment, the Asiatic populations, even in contact with Greek culture, were known to refuse the proffered boon, and to beg for monarchical rule.[1] These native princes were, however, only governors under Roman rule, just as many native princes in India govern under the supervision of the English, and they were not allowed to interfere with the free cities known as Greek.

---

[1] Above, pp. 64 *sq.*

But this Hellenism established by Rome was distinctly a *communal* affair, and the isolated cities through Asia never hoped for, or pretended to, any empire over neighbours, such as was still claimed by the Tauric settlements about the Sea of Asov. The cities of Asia Minor and the coast, with the exception of Rhodes, had not done so for centuries, and therefore fell easily into the groove marked out for them. So that all the exactions of the Romans, the losses by earthquakes, the contributions levied by warring powers, were unable to crush the prosperity of the cities of Asia. The cities of Greece proper, and of the Crimea, with their very different traditions, found the change hard, and rebelled against it both in open war and by stubborn discontent. The result was that, except Athens, whose primacy not even the sack and devastation of Sulla could destroy, the cities of Greece proper languished; their streets became empty; their business decayed. The exactions of war, the pressure of occasional famine and disease, were fatal to such decaying societies, and we can show from the attempts at union, or even fusion, among these very separatist societies how much they had come to feel their own weakness.

---

[1] E. g., the Cappadocians, when Pompey, on the extinction of their royal family, offered them liberty (Strabo, xii, 2. 11).

We now have a case of the positive amalgamation of two towns, Medeon and Stiris in Phocis, which seems to me unique.[1] But what other meaning can the many *κοινά* have, which the Romans permitted, as soon as Greece had calmed after the destruction of Corinth, and which meet us at every turn in the inscriptions down to the days of the Empire? Not only had Ætolia, Bœotia, and Phocis, the great islands of Rhodes and Crete, each united into *κοινά* embracing the whole districts or islands, but we find smaller local combinations under the same title meeting at Demetrias (Magnesians), Anticyra (Œteans), Larissa (Thessalians), and even a *κοινὸν τῶν Ἀθαμάνων* dedicating a statue to the legate Q. Brut. Sura. These local gatherings of cities, now villages (though to be called *κῶμαι* would have been an insult, and would have been politically and socially false), had their embassies, their diplomacies, their festivals, as if Greece were yet politically alive. But this subject will recur more naturally in connection with Plutarch's times.

I have already noted the habit usual with Roman magnates of bringing Greek philosophers in their train. Thus Antiochus of the Academy was the constant companion of Lucullus, Theophanes the Mytilenæan, of Pompey, as Panætius had been of the younger Scipio.[2] But in

---

[1] Cf. Beaudouin in *BCH.*, Vol. V, pp. 43 *sq.*, on this curious document, equalising the rights of all the citizens of both places, and enacting that such of the Medeonians as have held office already are not to be required to do so at Stiris, unless they volunteer. This view of public offices as burdens is characteristic of the times. I put the date later than M. Beaudouin does, and would refer it to the times now before us. The fusion ordered by Antigonus between Teos and Lebedos, and of which we have details in an inscription (cf. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 177), was imposed by him and not spontaneous.

[2] Cf. also the remarks of Strabo (xi, 1. 6) upon the relations of Posidonius to Pompey: "How can we trust him about obscure

Sulla we have a partial exception. He seems to have preferred less serious companions, and to have rather consorted with those Greek artists whose character is so reprehended in Aristotle's *Problems*[1]—actors, singers, etc.—and still more those soothsayers and prophets who were rife among the sanctuaries of Asia. This religion of emotion, this fear of occult influences, this worship of fortune as compared with reasonable forecast, were phenomena really more oriental than Greek, and were always at home in the eastern domain of Hellenism, while philosophy, and with it scepticism, dominated Greece.

But the long residence of Roman troops in Asia and the special temper of Sulla seem to have made this worship of wonder, and belief in miracles, the fashion in what I may call the school of Sulla. In the *Lives* of Lucullus and Pompey, as well as in the *Life* of the Dictator, there are strange stories told which would have been ridiculed by the circle of Scipio, or by the rational school of Cicero and Cæsar, who had learned from the philosophers of Athens and of Rhodes.[2] Though we may note this retrogression, there can be no doubt that the many aristocrats on Sulla's staff and in his army acquired a

---

matters, where he had no probable evidence to quote, when he says such extraordinary things about what is well known, and this, too, when he was Pompey's companion on his expedition to the Caucasus, between the Caspian and Colchian Seas? For when Pompey set out for the Pirate War, he chanced to meet Posidonius at Rhodes, and to have a discourse with him, and asked, as he was departing, whether the philosopher had any advice to give. Whereupon he answered in the words of Homer: 'Ever be brave and superior to the rest.' Add to this that he wrote the history of Pompey's deeds."

[1] Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 384.

[2] Cf. the anecdotes in Plutarch's *Sulla*, 27; *Lucullus*, 23; where Sulla's remark is quoted, that no forecast is so trustworthy as what is foretold in dreams.

familiarity with Greek quite different from that acquired by their elders from teachers in Rome. So Lucullus was always studying Greek culture, and Pompey, after settling the East, came back to Mytilene, Rhodes, and Athens to enjoy a literary and artistic holiday.[1] When there were daily dealings with Greek populations, and billeting in Greek towns, and leisurely winter quarters in historic places like Ephesus and Smyrna, the young generation of Romans must have acquired a ready and practical knowledge of Greek language and Greek ways. Plutarch, at the opening of his *Life of Marius*, notices that general's absolute ignorance and contempt of Greek letters as something exceptional, and yet even Marius was obliged to give a Greek representation on the stage, which he attended for only a moment. But he was, perhaps, the last of the narrow and vigorous Roman boors.

The very same causes, especially the winter campaign of Sulla in Asia Minor, are set down by the historians of Greek art as fixing the moment when the Roman taste for that splendid adornment of cities passed from a public into a private and individual feature. It had, indeed, long been the habit of the conquerors to bring the spoils of conquered cities to Rome, and this habit has remained in fashion through later days, as the arch of Titus manifests, down to the days of Napoleon, and even to our own, when relics of King Koffee or Cetwayo or Theodore are still treasured as interesting records of British victories. The results of the early victories of Rome over Greek cities were, of course, far more important, for the streets and public places of Rome were becoming crowded with statues famous in their old homes, and therefore prized without further discrimination by the victors. Even so educated a man as Cicero, brought up in the midst of these exhibited masterpieces, specially disclaims (in his Verrine orations) the title of connoisseur. Yet in his day the art treasures of great Greek cities had surely been long enough in Rome to educate many people of even moderate capacities. Marcellus had carried away from Syracuse in 212 B. C. the finest statues and pictures of that splendid art-centre, and they were exhibited in the temple of *Honos et Virtus* at the Porta Capena. The ruin of Capua brought additions to this booty, but they were trifling compared with the spoil of Tarentum, brought home in 209 B. C. by Fabius, of which Lysippus' colossal statue of Heracles on the Capitol was long famous.

---

[1] Plutarch, *Pompeius*, 42.

A few years later (197 B. C.) the triumph of Flamininus gained for Rome all the treasures which Philip V of Macedon had either inherited or plundered—the first contribution from eastern Greeks to the growing capital of the world. Even this acquisition was cast into the shade by the treasures paraded in his triumph over the Ætolians by M. Fulvius Nobilior in 187 B. C. These comprised not only the wealth of Thermus, of which I have spoken elsewhere,[1] but that of Ambracia, the brilliant capital of Pyrrhus and his successors. We hear of 285 bronze and 230 marble statues in this collection, for which the victor built the temple of Hercules Musarum. I need not do more than mention the names of Mummius and Corinth (145 B. C.).

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 417.

This long series[1] shows how fully Rome had been equipped with materials and museums—the special temples above named were in fact museums—for a thorough art education. Yet up to this point, and indeed for a generation following, there is hardly any sign of a development of Roman taste. We know that Metellus Macedonicus brought from Greece a company of architects and other artists to build his famous portico; but had even this specimen of Greek superiority remained isolated, his company of Greeks would have produced no further effect than the famous Italian stucco-workers did who came to Dublin in the last century, and filled all the old mansions of that city with their delicate art, and whose departure can be fixed almost to a year by the shocking contrast of the home work done while their beautiful designs were still fresh upon the walls and before the eyes of the Irish workmen. And yet over and over again Irish workmen have shown that they possess a talent for decoration of the highest kind, when a sufficient stimulus has been given.

In the Roman case, this stimulus is usually referred, not to the great exhibitions of art treasures which we have enumerated, but to the acquisition of the royal treasures of Pergamum through the bequest of the last Attalus. For then Romans first began to dwell in Greek Asia, and the most brilliant part of it, as administrators and curators of these things; their value as property came to be discussed, and no doubt many offers of money were made by rich Asiatic Greeks for art objects which the

---

[1] A very convenient list of all the named statues thus set up in Rome is given by Saalfeld, *Hellenismus in Latium*, pp. 84 *sq.*

Romans had overlooked as mere furniture. The campaigns of Sulla, implying winter quarters in Greece and Asia, enforced and extended this new knowledge in no ordinary degree, as the text of Plutarch tells us, so that this is really the epoch when the Romans began to turn from mere collectors of spoil into individual amateurs and *dilettanti*, at first gross and vulgar like Verres, then refined and educated like Lucullus. For, of course, the two types existed from the first; but the relative numbers of the former kept diminishing, while the latter increased.

The researches of the French School at Delos have, however, shown us that other permanent influences must have contributed to the result, and that Pergamum cannot be credited with a complete monopoly in Roman education.

These scholars have discovered a wealth of inscriptions both unexpected and unparalleled, except it be that of the Athenian Acropolis or the temple of Delphi; nor do I suppose that either of these great repositories of state documents equalled Delos, the latter in the importance, the former in the catholicity, of its records; for Greeks from all parts of the world sought permission from the Delians, more even than from the Delphians, to set up copies of important treaties in their famous sanctuary, both for publicity and for security in days to come. The result has been that upon the site of the temple of Apollo, and in other holy places at Delos, M. Homolle has already recovered sixty slabs, with at least four hundred multifarious inscriptions, many more than a hundred lines, some even several hundred lines, long. One of them, an inventory of the treasures of the temples, which was required when a new committee of curators (ἱεροποιοί) took over the charge from their predecessors, occupies forty-eight large pages of close printing.[1] From this and the other documents quite a new light has been thrown upon the history of the island, and especially upon its relations to the Romans, which have been treated by M. Homolle in a special monograph.[2]

Delos, as a sacred island, enjoyed from the earliest times the respect of all Greece, so that it was nominally free and inviolate, though its weakness made it really subject to the power dominant for the time being in the Ægean. Under the Athenian supremacy the treasures were administered by *amphictions*, afterwards by ἱεροποιοί. Even the Spartans, during their brief naval supremacy (404–394 B. C.), show by the offerings they made, and still more by their declaration to respect the rights and liberties of the island,[3] that they really controlled it. Under the renewed supremacy of Athens, when her reins were not drawn so tightly, and during the days of Philip and Alexander, we hear but little of Delos. The conflict for supremacy was not at that epoch a naval question.

In the troubles which supervened upon the death of Alexander, the islanders of the Ægean either formed or formulated more definitely a confederation, known in the inscriptions as κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν, probably for mutual defence against pirates. Several inscriptions thank certain individuals and give them general civic rights in all the islands for benefits conferred upon the *islanders*, and direct that they shall be crowned at the *Ptolemæa*, when the tragedies are being performed.[1] This feast indicates to us once more the able and far-seeing policy of the first Ptolemy, which I have shown in its proper light elsewhere;[2] for he took under his protection this league and was probably declared its formal president. Indeed, all the leading Diadochi, beginning with Peukestas and Craterus, sent offerings to Delos, but the real struggle for political power was between the Ptolemies and the Antigonids, one of whom (Gonatas) after his great victory at Cos controlled the league, as the *Antigoneia* celebrated there for some years prove.[3] He lost this control again after his defeat at Andros, and the Ptolemies, who apparently celebrated this victory by the founding of the *Euergesia*, maintained themselves till the helpless Epiphanes (Ptolemy V) abandoned all foreign policy. Under all these competing sovrans, with their many bounties, commemorated in formal votes of thanks, the Delians, nicknamed the "parasites of Apollo," and their league of islanders, which perhaps met at Tenos as well as at Delos, lived on in at least material comfort, and were probably under the protection of Macedon when the interference of the Romans and the declaration of independence made by Flamininus left them without a strong hand to preside over them.

---

[1] *BCH.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1 *sq.*, with M. Homolle's commentary.

[2] "Les Romains à Delos," *ibid.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 75 *sq.* These articles supersede all previous work upon the subject, even that of serious excavators like M. Lebègue, who began the work.

[3] Cf. M. Homolle on the restoration of this text, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 13. On Athens and the Adriatic cf. Dittenberger, No. 153.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 321; IV, p. 320; VII, p. 5; and now M. Delamarre's interesting text from Rheneia (opposite Delos), with a decree in favour of Philokles, admiral to the first and second Ptolemies. (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, I, No. 202.)

[2] *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 161 *sq.*; *Empire of the Ptolemies*, chap. 3.

[3] *BCH.*, Vol. X, p. 105.

This duty was undertaken by the Rhodians, who from 200 to 167 B. C. kept the seas with their guardships (φυλακίδες), and protected both trade and island property.[1]

But even now there begins the long series of inscriptions, either bilingual or relating to Italians, which make us feel that here, above all, the Romans were determined to effect a permanent lodgment on Greek soil. Accordingly, Delos begins suddenly to rise in importance, when the settlement of Greece after the battle of Pydna (168 B. C.) took place, and the Rhodians were to be punished for their independence or their secret sympathies with Macedon.

It was clearly in the interest of Roman traders that Delos was selected for the free port of the Ægean, and therefore the great centre of all the trade of the north-eastern Mediterranean. But the island was nominally handed over to the Athenians, who proceeded to expel the Delians and occupy it in company with Romans. Inscriptions now speak, not of the *demos of the Delians*, but of the *demos of the Athenians, and of the Romans dwelling in Delos.* We know that it became a great slave market; we know that, in addition to the Jews, Phœnicians, and Egyptians who had gradually settled there with their gods, Roman traders came in crowds; the destruction of Corinth was probably suggested by the strong commercial jealousies of Roman Delos; and though the government and its civil service were conducted by

---

[1] Cf. *BCH.*, Vol. X, pp. 123, 199, where Epikrates, an ἄρχων ἐπὶ τῶν νήσων, ἀποσταλεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥοδίων, is thanked for his services.

Athens, which sent there a high commissioner (ἐπιμελητής), as the English once did to Corfu, and though the titles of many officials show that sundry Athenians derived their income from this source, it is plain that to the Romans fell the lion's share of the profits.

It was from this stepping-stone that the Roman business men passed over to the province of Asia, which they claimed by the will of Attalus in 133, and which added greatly to the importance and the population of Delos. This is, indeed, the most brilliant epoch of its later history. Now it is that we find great corporations or companies of merchants settled there with splendid buildings, porticoes, temples of their own, and commemorating in many inscriptions their prosperity and their thanks to the gods. Of these the Hermaists were the most Roman, and the most important, with a sort of public place, like an exchange, within their porticoes. Most of their dedications are from Romans, and the whole island is tinged with Italian influences. The Athenians and Romans jointly built quays, marts, and temples, and even Puteoli is called a little Delos! For besides the Hermaists were Apolloniasts and Poseidoniasts, who were not only Hellenic Greeks, but Syrian Greeks from the coast of Palestine, Jews, and even freedmen. We find the worship of the *Lares*, the *Compitalia*, and an altar to *Bona Fides* commemorated in inscriptions about the year 100 B. C., as well as temples to Serapis, Isis, the Syrian Aphrodite, Adad, and Atargatis, even before that date. Delos was bidding fair to rival Alexandria, and collect all the wares of Asia Minor and of the Black Sea in her mart.

If the Athenians had been allowed to levy port dues, what a mine of wealth their possession of the island would have brought them! But the Romans insisted upon its freedom; the rich merchants even maintained a military guard; and we can imagine the Athenians jealous and bitter at these limitations, perhaps for that very reason hailing Mithradates as a naval power which would rid them of the Romans, whereas the population of the island was strongly Roman in policy, as it was mainly Roman in blood. Hence the impostor Aristion strove to seize it, and presently, when the Pontic fleet swept the Ægean, the Romans were massacred, and Mithradates ruled the island, not without solemn offerings, which are commemorated in the inscriptions.[1] After about three years (86–84 B. C.) he was expelled by the Romans, and now the *demos of the Delians* reappears. But Sulla was so forgiving and so conservative that he gave back the island to the Athenians. In 84 B. C. the Hermaist corporation was revived; in 79, the other two above mentioned; and a new course of prosperity seemed at hand. But though Cicero, in his speech for the Gabinian Law,[2] speaks of it as quite safe from the inroads of the pirates, that awful scourge fell upon Delos. The pirate Athenodorus, not twenty years after the massacre by the Pontic admiral Theophanes, made a systematic attack upon Delos, and not only slew or enslaved the whole population, but deliberately destroyed the splendid buildings and temples which were evidence of Roman life.

From this second disaster the island never recovered, though some inscriptions, and the founding of a sodality called the Pompeiasts, show that in the pacified Ægean

[1] *BCH.*, Vol. VI, p. 234.

[2] 18. 55.

the merchants tried to reconstruct their shattered homes. But whether, as M. Homolle thinks,[1] Puteoli carried off the trade, or whether, as I would suggest, the resurrection of Corinth, and its rapid rise, made Delos unnecessary, the island lost both its wealth and its population, and sank gradually into silence and decay. There only remained the ruins of its former splendour, and among them countless records of laudation, of dedication, of supplication to the gods, from all nationalities and countries, from Massanassa of Numidia to Mithradates of Pontus,[2] as well as catalogues of treasure, treaties of alliance, lists of membership in societies of which the name is often effaced. In these laudations, which form the larger part of the inscriptions everywhere during this epoch, and in which the preamble is the important part, as it often recites historical facts, men are praised, not only for their public conduct, but for their sentiments, for their good manners, for their modesty, as well as for their eloquence or poetic taste employed in the exaltation of Delos.[3]

Such are the materials from which the sagacity of M. Homolle has recovered a connected and rational story. Here we have in its focus the concentration of Roman-Hellenistic commercial life.

As appears from the foregoing sketch, the vicissitudes of Delos were not only in great part due to the invasion of Mithradates, but the consequences of this invasion were no mere passing misfortunes. It was first clearly shown by M. Theodore Reinach, in his monograph *Mithradates Eupator*, how deep and lasting were the consequences of the Pontic king's great struggle with Rome. There seems to have been no immediate successor of Alexander who understood so clearly that conqueror's policy. With all his protection and favour for Greek cities, for Greek culture, for Greek commerce, Alexander saw that the new great king who embraced both East and West in his dominions must not be a Greek, but an Iranian monarch. The feudal lords of Asia, and their clans and retainers, would never acquiesce in a Greek mercenary leader (as they would regard him) replacing the royal race which had overawed Asia with its majesty for centuries. And so Mithradates always posed as a Persian grandee of the purest blood. Hence he re-introduced into his wars with Rome the great ancient quarrel of Asia with Europe, which has subsisted in some form ever since the dawn of Greek history. It was also in the course of this struggle that he taught Rome the inefficiency of her military system. Mere official proconsuls were found wholly unequal to the difficulties of so long-sustained and vast a conflict. Hence it became absolutely necessary to appoint trained soldiers with larger powers to cope with the new danger. It was Lucullus, and Pompey, and in the end Sulla, who conquered Mithradates, but in doing so learned to conquer Rome also. Thus came the rapid centralisation of power in single hands, which brought with it the complete subjection of Hellenism to Rome. For Mithradates, oriental despot as he was, fully appreciated the value of free Hellenistic cities in his empire. It was he, in fact, that saved the cities of the Crimea for civilisation, who threw back and subdued the savage hordes which had well-nigh wiped them out. It was owing to the bold expeditions of Diophantus "that Chersonesus and Panticapæum, last sentinels of civilisation on the threshold of Scythia, kept alive their modest but useful light amid Cimmerian gloom, through all the centuries of the Roman Empire. Panticapæum lasted until the invasion of the Huns, Cherson even longer, for it was here that the great Russian Vladimir received baptism and gave birth to the idea of Holy Russia. So it is that across the centuries Mithradates joins hands with Peter the Great, the modern sovran most akin to him in his character and his aims." With these deeply suggestive words of M. Reinach I close my chapter.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, p. 153.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, p. 255.

[3] Here are some specimens from Nysa, in the valley of the Mæander: *ἡ βούλη καὶ ἡ γερουσία καὶ οἱ νέοι ἐτείμησαν* K.— *νεανίαν ἐπιφανῆ, γένους τε ἕνεκεν, καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἤθεσι σεμνότητος*, etc.; the next, *διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ κοσμιότητα καὶ διὰ τὰς τῶν προγόνων εὐεργεσίας* (*ibid.*, Vol. XI, p. 347). Another to a physician, because no one suffered from his hauteur (*ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 328). Another to a poet, *ἐπειδὴ Δημοτέλης Αἰσχύλου Ἄνδριος, ποιητὴς ὤν, πεπραγμάτευται περί τε τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Δηλίων, καὶ τοὺς μύθους τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους γέγραφε*, he is to be crowned with bay, etc. Cf. also *ibid.*, Vol. XIII, p. 245.

CHAPTER VII

THE HELLENISM OF CICERO AND HIS FRIENDS[1]

The Hellenism of Cicero and his circle is quite worth a separate chapter, for not only does the career of this celebrated man form an epoch in the history of Greek letters at Rome, but he has given us such copious and reiterated explanations of what he intended, and what he performed, that we are in no doubt or hesitation as to his peculiar title to literary fame.

We are not concerned here with Cicero as a politician, unless it be to show that his character in this relation corresponds with its literary aspects. He aspired, like most men of great intellect and weak character, to act as mediator between extreme men on both sides; he earned, as usual, what many such men have not deserved, the character of a trimmer. But in his case the general verdict is justified by his own statements. Anyone who will take an index to Cicero, and look up what he has said to and of Cæsar before his supremacy, during his supremacy, and after his murder, will require no further evidence. The retort of the displaced knight Laberius sums it all up. He was looking for a seat in the theatre, when Cicero, who did not want his company, but desired to retain his good-will, said: "I should gladly have made place for you beside me, were I not squeezed for room." "It is odd that you should be squeezed," was the retort, "seeing that you generally sit upon two stools."

---

[1] M. Gaston Boissier has written a whole volume, a very charming one, entitled *Ciceron et ses amis*, in which he never touches any one of the topics of the following chapter. My materials are simply drawn from a complete re-perusal of the orator's works, with special reference to my point of view.

Yet it is a curious reflection that what was in politics his disgrace was in letters his greatest title to honour. He was a mediator; he was distinctly the first Roman able to appreciate and translate Greek thought of the highest kind, while he also produced solid and splendid Latin work of his own. With Cicero Latin prose became distinctly a rival of the best Greek prose, and no critic who has honestly studied the great roll of Latin writers down to the Middle Ages can deny that here the Romans have produced a literature as first-rate, and as independent, as ever was produced by a people coming late in history, and therefore necessarily starting with great models before them.

This, then, is the keynote which Cicero perpetually strikes, and with reasonable pride. He boasts that in his day the highest species of Greek prose, which had hitherto defied the efforts of the Roman writers—philosophy—had been mastered by him, and reproduced in a clear and elegant Roman form. Whatever metaphysical critics may say as to the substance (and yet even here Cicero is by no means contemptible), there is no doubt as to the form. Anyone who ever since has had metaphysical ideas to propound, from Seneca to Descartes, has found Latin an adequate medium. There were other departments of prose in which he had great forerunners, as we have already mentioned.[1] In poetry, where he tried to naturalise epic hexameters, he distinctly failed. He met the fate of most great prose-writers who have attempted poetry. Lucretius, his greatest literary contemporary, of whom he hardly speaks, would probably have been as poor in prose as Cicero was in poetry. But the concurrent appearance of Lucretius and Catullus as poets, and of Cæsar as a historian, with Cicero as an orator and philosophic essayist, shows that his genius, like every other great and successful genius, expressed the spirit and the temper of its age.

---

[1] Above, p. 110.

Let us now turn from generalities to the details which he gives us concerning the education which produced these splendid results.

We may start from a curious passage which to many will suggest important inferences. In the speech *pro Rabirio Postumo*, among other very flimsy arguments which the orator is called upon to refute, is the following:[1]

> Object, if you please, that he went about in a [Greek] pallium [not a Roman toga], that he wore the insignia of a non-Roman man; all that this means is merely that he was rash in trusting his money, his fame, his fortunes to the caprice of a king (of Egypt). He was foolish, I confess; but the facts remain; either he must wear a pallium at Alexandria, if he was ever to resume his toga at Rome, or he must lose all his fortune, if he stuck to his toga. We have often seen, not merely Roman citizens, but noble youths, and even some senators of the highest families, not too in their private gardens or suburban villas but in the town of Naples, wearing a Greek head-dress—*mitella, delicarum caussa et voluptatis.*[2] You see L. Sulla, the dictator,

---

[1] 25 *sq.*

[2] "Here, at Naples," says Strabo, writing two generations later, "are found the deepest traces of Greek life, gymnasia and ephebia and phratries and Greek proper names, though the people are Roman. Now they have also a five-yearly feast, with musical and gymnastic

in a [Greek] chlamys, and the statue of L. Scipio, who conquered Antiochus, in the Capitol, not only in a chlamys, but in Greek slippers. And these men did not incur prosecution, or even criticism. We need not cite the case of P. Rutilius, who escaped the massacre of Mithradates at Mytilene by adopting Greek dress. So when Rabirius went to King Auletes, and the king proposed this way of saving the money, that he should become the king's financial minister [*diœcetes*], both the name and the dress were odious to him; but there was no help for it. For we know what it is to serve an absolute king.

We have here a plain statement of the fact that at an earlier stage of the contact between Greece and Rome an imitation of Greek fashions was tolerated, which was unpopular and censured in Cicero's day. Thus, to cite other evidence, T. Flamininus was, no doubt, both proud and envied because he could speak Greek, and join in the deliberations of a Greek assembly, whereas it was made a distinct charge against Cicero by a supporter of Verres that he had actually attended a Greek Senate (at Syracuse) and spoken in Greek there.[1]

---

contests which rival the most famous in Greece. . . . . The Greek customs of Naples are kept up by those who have lived by educating, and others who retire hither from Rome by reason of age or sickness, and live at their ease. This Greek aspect of society pleases not a few Romans who dwell there from choice" (v, 4. 7). This kind of refined retirement is quite different from the *pergræcari* of Plautus, a word which passed out of use with the idea it represents, and is noted in the dictionaries as ante-classical. Nicolaus Damascenus (*βιος Καισ.*, 4) specially insists that Augustus never in his youth wore anything but *Roman* dress, though he lived much in Greek lands.

[1] "Ait indignum facinus esse, quod ego in senatu Græco verba fecissem, quod quidem apud Græcos Græce locutus essem, id ferri nullo modo posse" (*in Verr.*, ii, 4. 66). I suppose the fear that lucrative foreign appointments might be limited to good Greek scholars was one cause of this strong feeling among the vulgar and greedy Roman nobles. There was a regular profession of interpreters in Sicily to explain Greek to the Romans (*in Verr.*, ii, 3. 84). These people were like the Levantines, who do this kind of duty now in Syria and Egypt.

Many natural causes can be assigned for this reaction. The evils which came in with Hellenism became more and more evident; and if about the very period with which our history in this volume begins (140 B. C.) the greatest families still held fast to the principle that all higher culture must come through Greek, the results were such as to alarm many strict and patriotic Romans. The political views of Scipio Æmilianus, the pupil of Polybius and Panætius, were suspicious enough, and his advocacy of a larger cosmopolitanism was so dangerous as to cause his assassination (129 B. C.), or at least the belief in it, which is enough for our argument. The career of the Gracchi, trained from the outset by Greek philosophers and grammarians, was still more ominous. The practical insignificance of the Greek race in politics made their theories all the more extravagant and reckless; and such a man as Blossius of Cumæ, who first inflamed both the Gracchi, and ultimately joined Aristonicus in his war for Pergamum against Rome, must have appeared to respectable Romans, even of a liberal type, peculiarly mischievous.

Cicero accordingly represents the great orators of the generation preceding his own—Antonius and Crassus—distinctly repudiating Greek training in their public utterances, on account of its unpopularity with the Roman public. He adds, no doubt, that in secret they zealously learned what they could from Greek books, and that they knew far more about them than they pretended. But to go to Greece for the purpose of study would have been in their day thought unpatriotic and unpractical. Crassus, indeed, had a confidential Greek slave as his amanuensis and reader,[1] but both he and Antonius are represented by Cicero in the dialogue as explaining how they came to Athens *in the course of their Roman official business*, and not for the purpose of study.[2] The whole treatise *de oratore*, put into the mouths of these famous Romans, is, indeed, based and built upon the Greek rhetoricians, with such practical modifications as Roman life dictated; but still the statements thus quoted are clear evidence of the drift of public opinion at the moment.

At the same time this very Crassus, when censor, issued an edict silencing the new Latin rhetoricians, who had started in imitation of the Greeks, and the reason he assigns[3] is not their introduction of Greek habits, but their gross ignorance as compared with Greek teachers in the same subject. They only professed Greek impudence without Greek learning. We find this strong contempt of Latin professional teaching (I am not speaking of the gratuitous lessons given by noble Romans) lasting up to the time of Cicero, though naturally, as Latin letters rose in importance, Latin schoolmasters improved in position and attainments. The orator tells us in a fragment[4] that he remembered meeting as a boy a certain L. Plotius, the first man who began to teach boys rhetoric in Latin; that Plotius was very popular, and attended by many zealous youths, so much so that Cicero himself wished to join his classes. "I was restrained from doing so," he adds, "by the authority of very learned men, who were of opinion that our talents would be better developed by Greek exercises." On these, therefore, Cicero had been nurtured, but at Rome; nor did he visit Greece for the purpose of study until he was a mature man, and well known as an advocate in the Forum.

---

[1] "Quod enim neque precibus unquam nec insidiando nec speculando assequi potui, ut, quid Crassus ageret meditandi aut dicendi caussa, non modo videre mihi, sed ex ejus scriptore et lectore Diphilo suspicari liceret," etc. (*de oratore*, i, 136).

[2] Cf. for Crassus, *de oratore*, i, 45: "Audivi enim summos homines, quum *quæstor* ex Macedonia Athenas venissem, florenti Academia," etc. For Antonius, *ibid.*, 82, which is still more explicit: "namque egomet, qui sero ac leviter Græcas litteras attigissem, tamen, quum *pro consule* in Ciliciam proficiscens Athenas venissem, complures tum ibi dies *propter navigandi difficultatem* commoratus: sed, quum quotidie mecum haberem homines doctissimos," etc. The combination "homo doctissimus" seems to me to mark the Roman standpoint of respectful contempt very well.

[3] According to Cicero, *de orat.*, iii, 93.

[4] Fr. 222 (ed. Nobbe), *ad M. Titinium.*

In his most interesting educational autobiography[1] he tells us how eagerly he studied in his youth the foremost Roman orators, and how he grieved at the exile of Cotta, one of the best. "But about that time, when the chief of the Academy, Philo, together with the leading men of Athens, fled to Rome in the Mithradatic war, I devoted myself altogether to him and his philosophy, though he denied all certainty in human judgments." In this year and the next, four of the principal Roman orators were put to death. "At that time I also attended Molo the Rhodian, a consummate pleader and teacher, at Rome." He then mentions a newer generation of Roman orators. "All this time I was immersed in every kind of study. I was under the Stoic Diodotus, who lived in my house till his recent death." With him Cicero chiefly studied dialectic. "I also practised declamation with one Piso and others, in Latin, and more frequently in Greek, either because Greek offered many means of improving my Latin, or because I could not be corrected or instructed by the highest Greek teachers unless I spoke in Greek." It was not till he had practised two years at the Roman bar that his friends and physicians made him travel to Asia for his health. He spent six months at Athens with Antiochus, of the old Academy, and Demetrius; with Menippus and others in Asia. He then went to visit Molo at Rhodes.

---

[1] *Brutus*, 89 *sq.*

He has told us nothing of the impressions produced upon him by this voyage, apart from his mere studies. Perhaps we may take it as a solitary trait from his own experience when he makes a speaker in the treatise *de natura deorum* say: "What percentage of men can be called beautiful? When I was at Athens, there was only one here and there to be found in the crowds of ephebi."[1]

With his son and his nephew, the young Ciceros, we advance another step. They are sent to study at Athens in their early youth, and are brought to travel in Asia Minor, by way of good education. They have a Greek tutor at home, and are accompanied by one abroad; but this does not prevent their going on a visit to King Dejotarus in Galatia while Cicero was proconsul in Cilicia. We have a letter from the orator's son, written from Athens,[2] in which he gives an account of his studies. The letter is rather a correct and priggish document, and we should greatly have preferred to see what he reported to his young Roman friends from his visit to King Dejotarus, who no doubt provided for him all the amusements of a Hellenistic court. What the policy of Dejotarus in lavishing these civilities was, and what his moral standard, will appear from Plutarch's account of Cato's visit to the same sovran.[1] The barefaced offering of presents and open profusion of bribery so offended Cato the very night of his arrival that he left the king next morning. Even then he found on his journey the king's gifts and money, which had been sent before him to Pessinus, with letters begging him to let his followers take these things, even if he himself refused them. What must have been the ordinary morals of Roman nobles when Dejotarus could hardly credit that Cato was an exception? Nor need we suppose that the king's presents and gratifications to young men excluded what he did not venture to offer the sober Cato. But we must be content with an epistle intended for his seniors, of which the following is the substance:

---

[1] i, 79.

[2] *Ad fam.*, xvi, 21.

> Cicero junior to his dearly beloved Tiro, greeting. I had been anxiously awaiting postmen, who came the forty-sixth day after they had left you. Their arrival delighted me intensely. For the letter of my most kind and beloved father afforded me the greatest pleasure, while the addition of your letters brought it to a climax. Accordingly, the interval which has elapsed in our correspondence no longer affords me any annoyance. For I really profited greatly by my silence, as it brought out your anxiety about me. I doubt not, dearest Tiro, that you were highly pleased at the reports which reached you about me, and I shall strive my best that this nascent opinion of yours shall grow and strengthen every day. Wherefore I hope you will be thoroughly justified in doing what you promise, in becoming a trumpeter of my fame. For I confess that such pain and anguish come upon me at the errors of my youth, that not only my mind recoils from the facts, but my ears from the very mention of them. . . . . As therefore you have once suffered grief about me, I shall take care that your joy may exceed it.

---

[1] *Cato Minor*, 15.

> Let me tell you that I am great friends with Cratippus, not as a disciple, but as a son. For I not only hear him with pleasure, but appreciate above all his characteristic sweetness. I spend whole days with him, and often a good part of the night. For I beg him to dine with me as often as possible. This having become a practice, he often drops in suddenly without our thinking about it, as we dine, and, laying aside severe philosophy, jokes with us delightfully. So I hope you will soon meet this most excellent and pleasant person. For what shall I say of Bruttius, whom I never allow to leave me, whose life is strict and proper, while his company is charming? For fun is not foreign to love of letters and daily intercourse. I have hired him a lodging close by and, as well as I can, sustain him in his poverty from my limited means. Besides, as I have begun declaiming in Greek at Cassius' house, I wish to practise in Latin with Bruttius. I have intimates with whom I spend my days, whom Cratippus brought with him from Mytilene, learned men and well known to him. Epicrates, chief of the Athenians [ephebi?] is much with me, and Leontides and such others. This is our news. As to what you write about Gorgias, he was very useful to me in my daily declamations, but I thought it paramount to obey my father. For he had written expressly that I should dismiss him at once. I did not like to temporise, lest my exceeding anxiety might cause him some suspicion, and of course it occurred to me that I had no right to question his judgment.

He then goes on to congratulate Tiro on having purchased a farm and turned a rustic Roman. He also promises to help him with capital whenever he shall want it. "But I beg of you to have a writing slave [*librarius*] sent to me as soon as possible, for I am losing much time in writing out my notes of lectures."

Here, then, is the sort of document a young man wrote to his parents from Athens. It is remarkable for its want of any appreciation of the natural beauties and historic interests of the famous city. And we need not make the excuse that he probably had said all this in other letters. For we perceive the very same absence of feeling for the picturesqueness of Greece in Cicero's own letters when he travelled through the East. We have a whole series of them[1] from Athens, Delos, Ephesus, Laodicea; and some of these cities he had not seen before. In none of them do we get even a hint as to the curiosities of these famous places. His mind is so full of Rome and politics that he has no time for anything else. What does he tell us of Athens? After a page of politics to Atticus:[2]

> What more have I to say? Nothing but this: Athens delighted me much — that is to say, the town, and the decking out of the town (*urbis ornamentum*), and your great popularity, and kindness shown to us. But what about the philosophy? It is all upside down. If there be any, it is in my host Aristos. For I had surrendered our common friend Xeno to be Quintus' host. But we saw him constantly.

This is all he has to say upon any of the Greek cities. Here is another characteristic passage:[3] "I hear that Appius is building a propylæa at Eleusis.[4] Would you think it foolish for us to do the same at the Academy [of Plato]? I think you will answer that you would. Well, then, write and say so. I indeed love Athens itself greatly. I wish to be known by some distinct monument. For I hate false inscriptions put on other people's statues in my honour."[1] Here the love of Athens is shown to mean nothing more than the amount of glory which he expected to gain from some connection with it. There is only one passage in all Cicero—the opening of the fifth book, *de finibus*—which shows the smallest sentiment in visiting this famous scene, and then it is merely the suggestion of the great philosophers which rises in his mind—no word about natural beauty, no word about art. The intelligent Romans, therefore, who visited Greece in these days went to talk with philosophers, to hear lectures from rhetoricians; but, so far as we can see, that was all.

---

[1] *Ad Att.*, v, 9 *sq.* Sulpicius' letter (*ad fam.*, iv, 12) may be an exception.

[2] v, 11.

[3] *Ad Att.*, vi, 1. 26.

[4] The remains of this entrance porch still exist, and were found in the recent excavations. Cf. Baedeker's *Greece* (3d ed., 1905), p. 103.

This view is confirmed by the whole series of letters of consolation addressed to noble Romans who were living in exile owing to the defeat of Pompey's party. The sixth book *ad familiares*, is full of these consolations, in none of which will be found one word of advice to study Greek art, antiquities, and history, and so relieve the mind of the tedium of separation from Rome. Cicero holds out hopes of restoration; he preaches Stoical resignation; he sympathises; he mourns. But he never thinks of advising his friends to do what any of us would have naturally suggested—to make the best of their enforced residence by entering into all the historic interests clustering about every Greek city. Cicero speaks for himself as being politically an exile at Rome—"non incommodiore loco, quam si me in Rhodum aut Mytilenas contulissem." He exhorts Trebatius: "tu modo ineptias istas et desideria urbis et urbanitatis depone;" but then Trebatius was in Britain or northern Gaul. Had he been in Athens, Cicero's language would hardly have been different. Thus he says to Curius: "I remember when I thought you a fool for preferring to live with these people rather than with us; for residence in this city, as it once was, is far more suited to your culture and politeness [*humanitati et suavitati tuæ*] than the whole Peloponnesus, not to say Patræ. Now, on the other hand, I see some sense in it," etc. All this language is perfectly consistent with his attitude in the Verrine oration *de signis*, where he formally deprecates being thought an art critic, as if it were something undignified and un-Roman.[1]

---

[1] To this fashion existing at Rhodes we shall revert when considering the evidence of Dion Chrysostom. On the other hand, the fashion of Romans building monuments at Athens has left remains to the present day. One of Cicero's most studiously worded letters is to Memmius, dissuading him from erecting a building on part of the original holding of Epicurus at Athens. Patro, the leading disciple of that school, who evidently thought it sacrilege, had entreated Cicero's interference (*ad fam.*, xiii, 1), and hoped to recover the site for the school.

Nevertheless, educationally, the value of Greece seems to have recovered again in the eyes of the Romans from the disfavour which we have seen expressed in the period 120–100 B. C. It was still the fashion to have a philosopher living in one's house at Rome. It was still the fashion to carry about a Greek historian, or else a Greek poet, to the wars, who would celebrate one's victories in courtly verse or in eloquent prose. Lucullus never went without his Greek to his wars, neither did Pompey.[2] Such was the *war correspondent* of that day. He was in the pay of the general, not of the public.

[1] Cf. above, p. 133; and *ad fam.*, vii, 6. 28.

[2] As to Pompey, cf. Cicero, *pro Archia*, 24: "quid? noster hic Magnus qui cum virtute fortunam adæquavit, nonne Theophanem Mytilenæum scriptorem rerum suarum, in concione militum civitate donavit?" As to Lucullus and his philosopher Antiochus, *Acad. prior.*, ii, 4.

There is also an interesting letter of Cicero to Cæsar[1] recommending a freedman of Crassus, called Apollonius, as a learned man; for he had spent much time with Diodotus the Stoic at Cicero's house: "Nunc autem, incensus studio rerum tuarum, eas litteris Græcis mandare cupit. Posse arbitror: valet ingenio; habet usum." He had, in fact, attended Crassus for the same purpose. And he now offers himself as war historian to Cæsar in Spain. For even yet, as Cicero declares in another passage, Greek was the world-language, while Latin was only used by the conquering race. "He that thinks he will attain less glory from Greek verses than from Latin is totally wrong. Because Greek is read by almost the whole world; Latin is confined to narrow limits."[2]

This was the history of the poet Archias' success. He came from Antioch at an early age to Italy, and not only made a reputation throughout Magna Græcia for extempore verses, but celebrated both the Cimbric war for Marius and the Mithradatic for Lucullus. He attained great popularity, says Cicero, not only among those who understood and appreciated him, but among those who pretended to do so. And of the latter there was a large supply. Accordingly, there was a very smart demand for Greeks at Rome, not merely for mountebanks and jesters to suit the tastes of Sulla and his society, not merely for musical and artistic people, such as accompanied a Clodius and directed the æsthetic judgments of a Verres, but for philosophers and literary men, half friends, half dependents, who helped both to educate and to amuse their patrons. We have already seen how Panætius began to

[1] *Ad fam.*, xiii, 16.

[2] *Pro Archia*, 23.

accommodate philosophy to Roman wants. He was followed in this path by Cicero's teachers, Antiochus and Molo; and we may be sure that what the heads of the schools did very seriously at Athens was done with facile complaisance by mere smatterers who dwelt at Rome.

It is not very safe to trust Cicero as a witness when he is pleading a cause. But in the following passage he must have known he was depicting a usual and typical case; I therefore quote it here as clearly relevant in the present connection. Cicero is usually very hard on the Epicureans; it is, in fact, only when writing to Atticus that he makes concessions to his friend's principles. But when he is handling an enemy like Piso, there is no limit to his censure of this very demoralising theory. No doubt, he found language as violent as he desired in the Stoic and other Greek books against Epicurus, to which I referred in a former chapter.[1]

The orator is describing the vulgarity and the vices of his opponent, and proceeds as follows:[2]

> There is a kind of luxury reprehensible indeed and extravagant, but still the luxury of a gentleman. [We may suppose the orator was here pointing to such a case as that of Lucullus.] This man has nothing tasteful, elegant, attractive; there is nothing large about him but his lust. No ornamental plate; huge wine-cups, and by way of compliment to his origin, of Placentian ware; his table supplied, not with oysters or fish, but with joints of overkept meat. There are shabby slaves in attendance, some even old; the cook answers the door; there is no bread baked in his house, in fact no storeroom; his bread and wine are bought round the corner. His Greek boon companions are packed tight at table, five or more on each couch [made to hold three]. He

---

[1] Above, p. 98, note.

[2] *In Pisonem*, 67 *sq.*

occupies the head of the table alone, and will drink what is served him from the same jar. When he hears the cock crow, he imagines the founder of his race [the crier of Placentia] is come to life again. He then stops the feast.

But some may say: "How do you know all this?" There is a certain Greek who lives with him, a man, as I can truly say from personal knowledge, quite a gentleman (*humanus*) in himself, or when he associates with anybody else than Piso. The Greek, meeting this brazen-looking youth, did not scorn his friendship, more especially as he was solicited, and became so intimate with Piso as hardly ever to be seen apart from him. I take it for granted I am now addressing an audience of educated men. No doubt you have heard that the Epicurean philosophers measure all human aims by the resulting pleasure. Whether this be right or wrong is no affair of ours, at least in the present connection, but it is a slippery kind of advice to give a not very intelligent youth, and is often dangerous. So as soon as this stallion heard pleasure being rated so high by a philosopher, he made no delay about it; he got so excited, he neighed in assent to the argument so loudly, that the other found himself no teacher of virtue, but an authoriser of vice. The Greek began, accordingly, to make reservations and distinctions, to explain in what sense the words must be taken. It was all no use. The other stuck to what he had heard, and was ready to take his oath that Epicurus expressly said no human good could be conceived, were all the pleasures of the body taken away. We need go no further. The pliant and charming Greek would not persist in contradicting a Roman senator (*Græcus facilis et valde venustus nimis pugnax contra senatorem populi Romani esse noluit*).

This man is, moreover, versed not only in philosophy, but also in letters, an unusual thing for an Epicurean. He proceeded to make a poem about Piso as graceful, as elegant, as can well be conceived. Let any of you that likes blame him, but in reason, not as an obscene and audacious ruffian, but as a Greekling, a flatterer, a poet. He fell into the snares of Piso, and, being a Greek and a stranger, was deluded by the same appearances that have deluded the great and wise Roman state into making Piso consul. Once involved in his intimacy, he could not recover himself, and of course he feared the charge of fickleness. Being pressed, incited, compelled, he addressed Piso in a poem expressing in very polished verses all his amours, adulteries, and other lusts.

I should quote from this mirror of Piso's life, which is widely known, did I not think it offensive in the present surroundings; and, moreover, I do not want to damage the writer. Had he been more fortunate in his disciple, he might have been more grave and sober; circumstances brought him into this sort of writing, most unworthy of a philosopher; if, indeed, philosophy, as they say, contains the discipline of duty and virtue, whose professors therefore should sustain a very lofty and responsible position. But the same circumstances which led him to profess philosophy without knowing what philosophy it would turn out to be, also defiled him with all the grossness of that obscene and abandoned brute.

By an exceptional good fortune, we are not left to judge of this philosopher-companion from Cicero's picture only; there are embedded in the volumes of the *Anthology* many poems of Philodemus of Gadara, one of which is addressed to Piso.[1] There were also embedded in the lava of Herculaneum many rolls of Epicurean philosophy—the library of some citizen who studied or professed this school. Among them have been unrolled the charred fragments of treatises by the same Philodemus, so that we can judge him both in his sportive and his serious moments. So exclusively, indeed, are the deciphered rolls Epicurean in character, and so many of them, even duplicates, are treatises by Philodemus, that Comparetti and others believe this library to have been that of the southern villa of his patron Piso, and that the philosopher not only lived in it, but probably wrote some of the books with his own hand.[1] However this may be, the epigrams[2] in the *Anthology* attributed to him corroborate but too plainly the verdict of the orator. Polished and often elegant in form, so much so as to be frequently the model of Ovid, sometimes of Horace, in amatory verse, the subjects and tone of these short poems are among the most sensual and gross in the *Anthology.* If, as Kaibel insists, positive obscenity is avoided, it is at least suggested at every turn; nor can we conceive any worse companion for a half-educated Roman youth than this polished discourser upon vice. Serious, too, he was at times, and cultivated, as his tract on music shows; exceedingly careful in his verse composition, as is shown in a careful analysis by his recent editor; but he was morally as bad as bad could be, and showed in a practical example how easily the Epicurean theory might degenerate into mere sensuality.

---

[1] *Anth. Pal.*, ix, 44.

As regards his views on music, they are contained in the chief treatise extant among the papyri, the tract *de musica.* Of this the fourth (and last) book is almost complete; and, indeed, the lacerated condition of the first three is less to be regretted, as the stray sentences show that in them, as in the last book, the author keeps restating the same arguments with tedious iteration. The purport of the work is to explode the current theory of all the older Greek philosophers, and of the Stoics, that music has a direct effect on morals, and is of direct benefit or the reverse to human character, according as it is wisely or foolishly practised. He argues that none of the arts could be assisted by playing music for the artist when at work; that it is impossible to sever the influence of the words from the music; and that whatever effects music may have arise from this and other associations, not from any direct effect of mere sounds upon the mind. He thinks it excusable for a simple and ignorant person to be misled by the authority of the ancients, but for an educated man and a philosopher it is a reproach.[1] His whole attitude is exactly that of ordinary modern thinkers, and opposed to the almost universal doctrine of the older Greeks.

---

[1] Cf. Scott, *Fragg. Hercul.*, p. 12.

[2] Edited specially by Kaibel, *Program* of Greifswald for 1885.

Such being the character of the house-philosopher in this ascertained case, we cannot doubt that Cicero's highly coloured picture represents a very frequent occurrence at Rome. Many Greeks, politically annihilated, financially ruined, having lost their national dignity and self-respect, saw no better occupation before them than to become the confidants of a Roman scapegrace.

So frequent, indeed, had this sort of educator become that the Roman estimate of the Greeks began gradually to change, and the Romans, who were once ridiculously anxious to pose as a branch of the Hellenic race, now assume a very different tone. They begin to despise the Greeks as such; they begin to assert themselves a superior race; and whatever archæological sentiment still remained, such as is implied by the legend of Æneas, the real condition of things is now this, that the Greeks count as one of the conquered nations foreign to Rome (*exteræ nationes*) and inferior to their conquerors. The evidence for this changed attitude is to be found in allusions all through the speeches and letters of Cicero. The reader will desire me to bring before him some of the scattered texts which prove this novel assertion.

---

[1] *τὸ δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων τετιμῆσθαι τὴν μουσικὴν ἰδιώτῃ μὲν καὶ ἀπαιδεύτῳ τεκμήριον ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς εὐχρηστίας συγγνωστόν, πεπαιδευμένῳ δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτι φιλοσόφῳ μέγ' ἂν ὄνειδος κ. τ. λ.* (*de mus.*, iv, 11).

We must remember that we are dealing with the evidence supplied by an inveterate advocate, who always sees men and things in the light of his client's, or his own, interests. But in spite of this—nay, sometimes because of this, as he always speaks to please a Roman audience—we can frame a clear picture of the mutual relations which then subsisted between the Roman victors and their Greek subjects. It is his interest in the Verrine orations to represent the Sicilian Greeks as the most reasonable and respectable of men, whose evidence is unimpeachable, and whose wrongs are without parallel. Yet even here, in introducing this subject,[1] what does he say? After speaking of this province as an old and valued granary of Rome, and a pleasant place of excursion for Romans, he proceeds:

> In the men, too, of the province, gentlemen, there is such hard work, worth, and frugality that they approach nearest to our own antique course of life, not to that which has since come into fashion among us. *There is nothing in them like the rest of the Greeks;* no laziness, no luxury; but the greatest diligence and economy in both public and private affairs.

Yet in speaking of certain arbitrators named by Verres, he says: "there was no Roman citizen among them, but sacrilegious Greeks, inveterate villains, brand-new Cornelii;"[2] and in these very speeches, when he comes to the

[1] *In Verr.*, ii, 2. 7.

[2] ii, 3. 69.

case of Verres appointing one of his admirable and honest Sicilian people commander of a fleet, he does not so much inveigh against the character of this particular person, Cleomenes, as against the indignity, the unheard-of insult, of putting a fleet of the Roman people under the command of a Sicilian Greek.[1] Let me add, in correction of the charge just cited of laziness and luxury against all the Greeks, that the orator tells us he himself saw at Sparta bands of youths fighting almost to death, in contempt of pain, and that they still submitted to flogging at the altar of Artemis without a word, till some of them even died.[2] Accordingly, as typical examples of men bearing pain better from hereditary traditions and from training than most philosophers could bear it from principle, he cites, not the solid Romans, but the volatile Greeks! The truth of his statement about the Spartan boys is confirmed twice over by the testimony of Plutarch, who says he saw them die under the lash, and by that of Dion.[3]

The defence of L. Flaccus is an interesting counterpart of the prosecution of Verres. Flaccus had vigourously helped Cicero in the affair of Catiline, and so the orator undertakes to defend him, though the whole of Asia demands his punishment for three years' extortion and malversation when pro-prætor in that province. I will not say that Flaccus was as unvarnished a ruffian as Verres. But this is certain, that if he had been, Cicero would not have scrupled to defend him as he has done; and this is also certain, that if he had not committed the grossest crimes and injustices, the provincials would never have raised a finger to prosecute him. They would have been too grateful even to a moderately unjust and vicious Roman governor. Our interest, therefore, in this speech fixes on the way in which the orator speaks to Roman prejudices as regards the Greeks of Asia.

---

[1] ii, 5. 82.

[2] *Tusc. quæstt.*, ii, 14 and 20; v, 27.

[3] Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 18; *Aristides*, 17: Dion Chrysostom, *Oration* xxv.

He first attacks the witnesses against Flaccus *in globo:*

> What witnesses are they? Greeks. Not that I of all men should derogate from the credit of that nation. If ever there was a Roman of Greek predilections, given to Greek studies, it was I; and when I had more leisure, to a greater extent even than now. There are among them many good, learned, sensible men, but these do not appear before us; there are many of the reverse kind, who are here. Moreover, this I will say about the whole Greek race: I grant them talent in letters, in teaching many arts; I will not deny their grace in conversation, their acuteness in thinking, their wealth of eloquence; if they claim any additional merits, I concede them. But moral strictness and truth in giving evidence (*testimoniorum religionem et fidem*) that nation has never practised; they have no idea of the importance, weight, and authority of this matter.

And so there is a Greek phrase known even to those who know no other word in the language: "Lend me your testimony."[1]

He goes on to cite cases of Romans refraining from giving evidence against their opponents:

> Had these been Greeks, and had not our morals and training been stronger in them than their wrath and bitterness, they would all have sworn they were robbed and ruined. The Greek

---

[1] A comparison of Plutarch's observations on this point (*de vitioso pudore*, 6) will corroborate what Cicero says, as being true, even in later days. For nations seem never to change their essential features.

> witness comes forward to injure his opponent; he does not think of his oath, but of the damage he can do. To break down in cross-examination he regards as most disgraceful; against that he guards himself; he cares for nothing else.

And so he describes them as a people, "quibus jusjurandum jocus est; testimonium ludus; existimatio vestra, tenebræ; laus, merces, gratia, gratulatio proposita est omnis in impudenti mendacio."

It is difficult not to wonder at the modern complexion of all this. Parallels in our own day and the British Empire start up unbidden, however angrily the pedant may threaten us, however loftily he may warn us against illustrating a remote age of civilisation by the clear analogies of modern life. Let it be remembered that most Greeks looked upon the Romans as foreign conquerors, who had taken from them their liberties, whose law was therefore a foreign law, to be evaded or violated, as far as possible, not only without guilt, but with a certain show of patriotism. They were proud "to defeat, and by defeating to defy, this law," if I may use the words recently addressed to his diocese by an archbishop of the Roman Church in Ireland.

Cicero goes on to criticise the value of a Greek *psephisma,* or plebiscite, given by show of hands of the assembled cobblers and tinkers of a city, excited with harangues, and voting without a moment's interval for reflection. The whole of Greek history, he says, not only in its present decadence, but in its best days, was disgraced by the license of its public assemblies, by the random judgments of people gathered together to hear harangues. He contrasts with it the wisdom of the

Romans in separating the voting altogether from the talk, and so interposing an interval between the discussion and the decision.[1]

But Cicero introduces this famous attack on Greek public honesty (which tallies so well with what Polybius had said two generations earlier[2]) with the remark that he knew many good, true, and cultivated men among them. What evidence have we of any friendship with such Greeks in his writings? I will not speak of the philosophers from whom he learned, and who were not his friends any more than schoolmasters or college tutors are now friends of most of their pupils. But even taking them into account, is it not remarkable that among them all we do not find (except Tiro) a single Greek correspondent in his very numerous epistles?[3] The reader may wander through books of them, many written to and from Hellenistic lands, and yet he will find no Greek or Asiatic friend mentioned as a correspondent. When we come to the thirteenth book *ad familiares*, which consists of letters of introduction or recommendation, we at last stumble upon a number of letters commending Greek acquaintances to the Roman governors or officers of the provinces. He speaks of these Greeks, indeed, in the highest terms, saying that not only had they been his hosts, but that he lived with them *familiariter*, and that he had been delighted to see them at Rome. But they are clearly not of his rank; he regards them as a man of rank would now regard a respectable lodging-house keeper.[4] Many of them are freedmen, some of them traders with whom he and his friends had invested money. The real feeling towards all these people comes out in the last of the series, which commends Democritus of Sicyon. "He is not only my host," says Cicero, "but, what seldom happens, especially among Greeks, very intimate with me. You will find him the principal man, not only of his city, but perhaps of all Achæa." It was evidently of the last importance to these Greeks to be well recommended by a Roman of distinction to the incoming prætors or proconsuls, and we may be sure Cicero's letters were anxiously solicited. But though they were requitals for hospitalities received, they were not real or deep expressions of genuine friendship or respect.

---

[1] *Pro Flacco*, 15 *sq*.

[2] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 527.

[3] Did Tiro, his editor, suppress them? "Vitio gentis nunquam partitur amicum."

[4] The special letters in point are *ad fam.*, xiii, 1. 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28*b*, 32, 34, 36, 37, 48, 52, 53, 54, 67, 70, 78.

The views of Cicero come out in many other places. In writing to his favourite freedman and secretary, Tiro, who was ill, and to whom he uses almost extravagant words of affection, he says[1] of the very Lyso whom he had strongly recommended among the people above mentioned: "I fear our Lyso is rather negligent, *first, because all Greeks are so;* next, because he did not answer my letters." He says of the boy's tutor Dionysius, who had not shown any loyalty to them when their party was overthrown by Cæsar: "But I don't expect such qualities in a Greek."[2] He says the ebullition of public feeling at Naples when Pompey recovered from his illness was *ineptum sane negotium et Græculum,*[3] and he sums up all these judgments in the famous letter to his brother Quintus on the duties of a provincial governor,[4] where he warns him against intimacies with the Greeks, of whom but few are still worthy of ancient Hellas. Most of them are fickle and deceitful, and through long slavery trained to excessive complaisance. They should all be treated liberally, and the best of them even admitted to your house and friendship. But too great intimacy with them is not safe, for they dare not oppose our wishes, and they envy not only us, but one another. "Be therefore very cautious and careful in making friendships with provincials and Greeks." He adds in another place[1] a candidly dishonest apology for his own apparent violation of these precepts:

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, xvi, 4. [2] *Ad Att.*, vii, 18. [3] *Tusc. quæstt.*, i, 86.
[4] *Ad Quintum fratrem*, i, 1. 16 *sq.*

> I now come to answer your letter in which you complain that I strongly recommended to you Zeuxis of Blandus (or Blaundus in Phrygia), an undoubted matricide. Concerning this case, and all others like it, if you should wonder at my courting popularity so strongly among Greeks, pray observe what follows. Perceiving that the complaints of the Greeks have more influence than is right, owing to their natural habit of exaggerating, I soothed, in any way I could, all such as I heard complaining about you. First I mollified the people of Dionysopolis, who were strongly against me, whose chief man Hermippus I muzzled not only by talking to him, but by admitting him to my intimacy. Hephæstus of Apamea, Megaristus of Antandrus (a worthless person), Nicias of Smyrna—the most trivial creatures, I compassed all with my affability, even Nympho of Colophon. I did all this, not that such men, or even their whole nation, delight me; I am sick of their want of character (*levitas*), their obsequiousness, their devotion, not to principle, but to the profit of the hour.

He then goes into very interesting details concerning these cases.

At last, then, the Romans were beginning to assert themselves, not only against Italian provincials, whom they despised as speaking Latin with a bad accent and in rustic phrase,[1] but against all their subjects, barbarian and even Greek. The opening of the *Tusculan Disputations* is a noble and eloquent assertion of this Roman dignity. The deep severance between barbarians — Africans, Spaniards, Gauls—and Greeks is indeed still felt,[2] but the fierce prosecution of Ligarius by Tubero is justly called by the orator a foreign thing. "No Roman citizen ever did it. *Externi isti sunt mores.* The hatred of either fickle Greeks or savage barbarians is wont to demand blood."[3] Nor is this remarkable phrase solitary. In the tenth *Philippic* he speaks of *exteræ nationes a prima ora Græciæ usque ad Ægyptum.*

---

[1] *Ibid.*, i, 2. 4.

Thus we have the Romans at last repudiating, or forgetting, their ancient anxiety to pose as an offshoot of the Hellenes, and coming to regard the Greek as only a superior kind of outsider, worse than the Roman in moral principles, worse even in manners, owing to his fickleness, and also to his ungovernable excitability, which caused many extravagances painful to a calm and self-possessed aristocracy. It is quite consistent with this that we should find another mark of the foreign manners in the *over-gesticulation* of the Greeks, which Cicero censured when they were giving evidence in court. They seasoned their replies with raising of eyebrows and shrugging of shoulders. We could imagine him an English critic censuring French or Italian witnesses.[1]

---

[1] I am not here concerned with the Latin subjects, but call attention to the passage *de orat.*, iii, 42 on this question. "Just as the commonest Athenian far surpasses the most learned Asiatic in the tone and sweetness of his accent, so the most ignorant Roman speaks better than the most learned of the Latins, though they study literature far more closely than Romans do." He reverts to this subject of accent in his *Brutus* (171 *sq.*) in discussing the learning and ability of provincials. Even the orator himself turns aside in his speech *pro Sulla* (22 *sq.*) to answer the taunt that he is a *peregrinus* because he came from Arpinum. We have no parallel to this, however an Irishman or Scotchman may be twitted for his provincialism, for Ireland and Scotland are far stronger in regard to England than the Italian provinces were to Rome. All this does not prevent Cicero from recognising even in Roman Latin a vulgar and low way of speaking—*oppidano quodam et incondito genere dicendi*, as opposed to the *urbanum genus.* On the Spanish brogue of Corduba, cf. *pro Arch.*, 26.

[2] *Ad Quintum frat.*, i, 1. 28, 33.

[3] *Pro Ligario*, 11.

There were perhaps only two points in which the supremacy of the Greeks was still acknowledged—art and philosophy. I have put art first, as we shall dispose of philosophy in very few words. There is a whole speech of Cicero against Verres (*de signis*) devoted to art questions; for Verres pretended to be an art critic, and many of his worst thefts were of works of art. Hence Cicero can give us much information both on the nature and on the number of the precious objects preserved and valued by the Sicilians and other Greeks in these days. For as Verres' robberies were not confined to Sicily, so we hear stray facts concerning the artistic condition of other provinces. But Cicero almost ostentatiously repeats to the jury that he himself is no art critic,[2] and that what he says on this point is derived from the judgment of the Greeks—paramount masters in this branch of culture, and whom even Verres must keep beside him as advisers upon the value of antiquities. Cicero[3] gives an account of two miscreants who had to fly from their home at Cibyra, where they had been workers in terra-cotta, and who took refuge with Verres to perform the duty of revising his judgments on art. But for all that they did not save him from atrocities in taste, as well as in life and morals.

---

[1] "Dixerunt hic modo nobiscum ad hæc subsellia, quibus superciliis renuentes huic decem millium crimini? Iam nostis insulsitatem Græcorum; humeris gestum agebant" (*pro Rabirio Post.*, 36).

[2] Above, pp. 133, 156. [3] *In Verr.*, ii, 4. 30.

We are astonished, in the first place, that in a province so long subject to Rome, after the devastations of the slave wars, of *publicani*, and of prætors, so many art treasures should still have survived. But such seems really to have been the case. Not only were the temples adorned with statues by the greatest Greek artists—statues which had been carried to Carthage and formally restored by Scipio when he conquered that city—but there were rich private men who possessed such treasures, which were the pride of their cities, and were most liberally shown to all Roman visitors by the owners.

The opening case in the speech, that of Heius of Messina, is a case in point. He had in a private chapel four *chefs-d'œuvre*, which Verres plundered under pretence of a sale for the ludicrous sum of 6,500 sesterces (£40)—a Cupid of Praxiteles for 1,600! "Whereas," says Cicero, "we have often seen 40,000 given at an auction for a small bronze."[1] The only work of art left to Heius by his plunderer was an archaic wooden statue of Fortune, probably because the taste for antiquities, as such, did not yet exist among Romans of this class. Cicero repeatedly declines all responsibility for the judgments pronounced upon these things; he says he has seen many of them; indeed, they were the first thing shown to visitors in any Greek town, and that by a special class called *mystagogi*.[2]

---

[1] 14.

[2] How disgusted he would have been, had he foreseen that in after ages this profession should be called *Cicerones*!

He mentions in other houses cups of Boethus, chased work of Mentor; gems and medallions which Verres tore from their settings in cups and vases. In fact, there was hardly a respectable house in Sicily which did not retain at least a remnant of old luxury in platters, or censers of old plate, used in the family devotions, and prized above all else.[1]

These were the articles which Verres everywhere sought and carried off from the people. And, indeed, what wonder, when he had robbed the young King Antiochus (son of Selene), who visited him when returning from Rome to Asia, and who was unsuspecting enough to show him his splendid plate. The details of this shameless robbery are well-nigh incredible (§§ 61–72). There were also famous historical paintings—the battles of Agathocles, portraits of the old kings and tyrants; there were splendid double doors wrought of gold and ivory, generally dedicated to temples, just as our treasures of mediæval painting and carving are almost all to be found in old churches. All such things Verres ruthlessly carried off. But what Cicero represents as the worst of all was the rape of the gods themselves from their shrines, and this under the constant pretext that the authorities of each city had sold them.

> Do you think, gentlemen, that this despoiling of their temples affected them with any ordinary grief? Not so, verily, first, because all men have religious feelings and think that their paternal gods, handed down from their ancestors, are to be sedulously preserved and honoured; secondly, because these treasures, these works of art, statues, pictures, delight the Greeks beyond measure. And thus from their complaints we

can gather that these losses are to them most bitter, which may perhaps seem to us trifling and of little account. Believe me, gentlemen, of all the calamities and injustices suffered during late years by our allies and foreign nations, none have the Greeks felt, or do they feel, worse than this plundering of temples and shrines. Let Verres pretend as much as he likes that he bought them; believe me, no polity in the whole of Greece or Asia ever did sell of its own accord to anybody any statue, picture, or public ornament.[1] .... Know then that this alleged sale is far more offensive to the cities than if he had carried away their treasures by force. They deem it the lowest turpitude for a city to be induced by money to part with the public heirlooms handed down to them from their ancestors. For remember that the Greeks delight marvellously in things which we despise. And so our ancestors suffered all these things to remain among their allies, that they might be as prosperous as possible under our empire; and left them to those whom they made tributary, in order that men who delight in things which we depise, might have them to beguile and solace their servitude. What do you think the people of Rhegium would take for their marble Venus? or the Tarentines, to lose their Europa sitting on the bull, or their Satyr in the temple of Vesta? or the Thespians for their Cupid, the sole attraction of Thespiæ? or the Cnidians for their marble, the Coans for their painted, Venus? What the Ephesians for their Alexander, or they of Cyzicus for their Ajax or their Medea? What the Rhodians for their Ialysos? What the Athenians for their marble Iacchus, or painted Paralus, or the bronze cow of Myron? It is tedious and unnecessary for me to enumerate all the treasures which are to be seen in each city of Greece and Asia. I mention them that you may realise the grief which is felt when such things are carried off.[1]

---

[1] It seems, nevertheless, that the town of Sicyon parted with its famous pictures a very few years later to liquidate a public debt to Cicero's friend, the banker and money-lender Atticus (cf. Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, xxxv, 11. 127). Nor do I imagine that this was the only case. I suppose these city heirlooms were not more sacred or more precious than the private heirlooms of great English nobles—pictures, plate, china, books—which we see coming into auction-rooms every year. The mansions of these people will presently resemble the unfortunate and degraded Greek cities, with their empty temples, their deserted senate houses, and the pedestals of their auctioned gods.

How deeply significant is all this passage as to the altered relations of Rome to Hellenism! What was true of Sicily was certainly true, in a greater degree of Asia. The wealth in art and antiquities was even greater; the excesses of Roman governors—Verres, Piso, Gabinius,[2] Flaccus whom Cicero defended—fully as odious. The love of art in the Greek cities, and its close identification with religion, were actually coming to be despised by serious Romans, who associated this fancy with levity of character.

But there was a lower stratum of Romans who took up the fashion of art, ignorantly and without the smallest *religion;* and these were the most odious scourge of the subject nations. For there appears to have been no improvement since the condition of things described in a former chapter. Nay, rather, since the revolution of C. Gracchus, who had handed over the trials for provincial peculation to juries of Roman knights, from whom the tax-gatherers were also drawn, convictions were usually to be obtained only against such governors as Rutilius Rufus, who protected the provincials. Nothing is more affecting than Cicero's pictures of the misery of the subjects, and yet it is almost a rhetorical commonplace with him.

Here are some characteristic passages. When speaking of Pompey's high qualities,[3] "consider his temperance! No avarice, no lust, the beauty of no city seduced him to indulgence, its historic fame to sight-seeing; finally the statues and pictures and the adornments of Greek cities, which others regarded as plunder, he would not even look at." This was by contrast to such men as Piso, who was called the "Vulture of the provinces."[1] Cicero states[2] that as soon as he himself held assize courts in his province of Cilicia, he freed many towns from the most savage tributes, the most oppressive usury, and fictitious debts. His advices to Quintus on provincial government imply the same state of things, and his public letter *To the Senate* as regards the threatened Parthian war[3] sums up the natural results:

---

[1] §§ 132 *sq.* [2] Cicero, *pro Sestio*, 93, 94. [3] *Pro lege Man.*, 40.

> For the auxiliary forces of our allies are either so weak, owing to the severity and injustice of our rule, that they cannot help us much, or so disaffected that nothing can be expected from them, far less entrusted to them. It is hard to express, Quirites, how hated we are among foreign nations, owing to the lust and injustice of those whom we sent to govern them during these years.[4]

At the opening of his oration *de provinciis consularibus* he draws a picture of the state of the eastern provinces as shocking as that of Sicily under Verres, and recounts the atrocities perpetrated in Macedonia, in the city of Byzantium, in Achæa, and in Syria. I need not quote from the opening chapters details closely analogous to what has already been given. We can, therefore, hardly call his rhetorical outburst in the Verrines[5] exaggerated:

---

[1] *In Pis.*, 37, 38. Cf. also *pro Flacco*, 18: "Mirandum vero est, homines eos, quibus odio sunt nostræ secures, nomen acerbitati, scriptura, decumæ, portoria morti, libentes arripere facultatem lædendi, quæcunque detur."

[2] *Ad fam.*, xv, 4.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1.

[4] *Pro lege Man.*, 65.

[5] ii, 3. 207.

Lugent omnes provinciæ, queruntur omnes liberi populi; regna denique jam omnia de nostris cupiditatibus et injuriis expostulant: locus intra oceanum jam nullus est, neque tam longinquus neque tam reconditus, quo non per hæc tempora nostrorum hominum libido iniquitasque pervaserit. Sustinere jam populus Romanus omnium nationum non vim, non arma, non bellum, sed luctum, lacrimas, querimonias non potest.

This evidence, so constant, so uniform, cannot but be regarded as proving the proposition laid down early in this work, that the officers of the Roman Republic were the worst tyrants whom the world had yet seen, and that any agent able to overthrow them would be justly hailed as the deliverer of mankind.

I say the officers of the Republic were tyrants, for if nothing remained but the official decrees of the State, we should no more suspect the real state of things than we should from the decisions of the Romish Inquisition, which hand over the victim to the civil power to be punished *citra sanguinis effusionem.*

As the name of the dictator Sulla appears in several recently recovered inscriptions, so the name of *Marcus* (*Μααρκος*) *Tullius Cicero Cornelia* (of the Cornelian tribe) turns up as one of the senatorial witnesses to a *senatus consultum* sent to the town of Oropus in Bœotia, and engraved on marble by that grateful polity. This is one of a score of documents of the kind recovered in their Greek version from various parts of the Greek world. I am not concerned with these decrees in their Roman, but in their Greek, aspect, and I cite them in the same way as Josephus cites them, as evidence of the consideration in which the dependencies of Rome stood to the ruling powers.

The earliest of these documents which come within the period of this book (there is one as early as 189 B. C.) follows closely upon the Roman pacification of Greece, but I have reserved it till this moment, when the whole group can be conveniently discussed.[1] It is the decision of the Senate in an old dispute concerning boundaries between the towns of Narthakion and Melite in Thessaly, which had been decided in favour of Narthakion by Flamininus, in his settlement of northern Greece.[2] Not content with his verdict, the Melitæans had appealed to external Greek arbitrators—a common practice, as numerous inscriptions prove—but the Samians, Colophonians, and Asiatic Magnesians had given it against them. At last they appealed to the Senate, when C. Host. Mancinus is named as prætor, and they received from it a decision confirming the previous adverse sentences. The facts of the case, with a special reference to Flamininus, and the decree, were set up in an inscription at Narthakion, on the site of which it was recently found.

The other two which I shall here specify[3] are those from the days of Cicero, shortly after the conquest of the East by Sulla. One of them confirms all the privileges accorded by the dictator as plenipotentiary-general to Stratoniceia in Caria, which at the head of Carian cities stoutly resisted Mithradates, and incurred great danger and loss. Its date must be 81 B. C.; and, in answer to eight petitions of the Carians, the Senate (under Sulla's direction) gives eight confirmatory replies.

---

[1] Cf. Latischev in *BCH.*, Vol. VI, pp. 364 *sq.*

[2] Cf. Livy, xxxvi, 51.

[3] There are at least seventeen now recovered in inscriptions, of which a partial list is given by Cousin and Deschamps, *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 225. Viereck's *Sermo Græcus*, etc., is the most complete tract on this question (Göttingen, 1888).

The third is known as the *senatus consultum* of Oropus, which has been commented on by Mommsen.[1] It is the answer of the Senate to an appeal from Oropus against the *publicani*, who insisted upon taxing the lands about the temple of Amphiaraus. Sulla had declared that the property of the gods should be exempt. The *publicani* declared that Amphiaraus was not a god. Cicero was present at the discussion, and his name, as I have already told, is appended as a witness. The case remained in his memory, for he alludes plainly to it years after in his tract on the *Nature of the Gods:*

> An Amphiaraus sit deus et Trophonius? Nostri quidem publicani, cum essent agri in Bœotia deorum immortalium excepti lege censoria, negabant esse immortales ullos qui aliquando homines fuissent.[2]

But this scepticism, prompted by greed, the Senate would not accept.

Quite apart from the tenor of these documents, which exhibit the reasonable and just side of Roman rule—I mean the public and responsible acts of the Senate as opposed to the injustices of individuals invested with arbitrary powers—the form of them is interesting as giving not only the order of procedure, but the style and composition of these Greek documents. Foucart was the first to perceive that they were translations from the Latin originals, made at Rome, and sent to the provincials without the Latin text. They are written in the vulgar "common dialect" of the Greek world, with stock translations, and bad ones, of Latin terms. There are also gross Latinisms, which show that such men as Cicero could hardly have revised them.[1] So careless had the Senate now become of the appearances of culture, which were studiously put forth in earlier days.

---

[1] *Hermes*, Vol. XX, pp. 262 *sq.*

[2] iii, 18. 49.

Nevertheless, this contemptuous tyranny, and perhaps still more contemptuous justice, towards the Greeks, had not yet eradicated the old Roman weakness of copying their greater refinement. We cited above the habit of wearing Greek costume (p. 146); we hear of many Romans on their travels soliciting the "freedom" of their cities from the Greeks, though, as Cicero explains,[2] such a privilege was inconsistent with Roman citizenship, which was *exclusive*, in contrast to Greek citizenships, which could be multiplied, and did not exclude any foreign privileges.

> And so we see in the Greek states, e. g., at Athens, Rhodians, Lacedæmonians, etc., enrolled, and the same men citizens of many cities. I see some uneducated persons, citizens of ours, misled by this, enrolled at Athens among the jurymen and Areopagites, named as to tribe and number; whereas they ought to know that if they obtained that citizenship, they must *ipso facto* have lost ours, unless they recovered it by the process called *postliminium*.

In the case of Roman exiles in Greece, this Greek adoption was almost the rule, but when the punishment was over, the legal fiction Cicero names should have been necessary, strictly speaking, before the Roman could return to his home.

---

[1] Cf. Cousin and Diehl in *BCH.*, Vol. IX, p. 37 for a list of these defects. *Pro magnanimitate sua* ὑπὲρ μεγαλοφροσύνης; *suus* appears as ἴδιος; *extra ordinem* as ἐκτὸς τοῦ στιχοῦ; *integer* as ἁγνός, and so on (cf. Viereck, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 *sq.*). This must be the work of some inferior clerk.

[2] *Pro L. C. Balbo*, 28 *sq.*; cf. Plutarch, *Solon*, 24, for the same notion.

But there were still many Romans who not only affected Greek citizenship; they affected the Greek language; they professed fancies as to Greek prose, some rejecting Demosthenes for the simplicity and antique grace of Lysias, others pretending to admire Thucydides, whom they could not understand, above Xenophon, whom they could.[1] These are the people whom Lucilius ridiculed in the person of Albucius, their *coryphæus* in his generation, and who coupled this admiration of Greek with contempt of Latin orators and poets.[2]

To turn from art to philosophy, they adopted too, with Epicurean tenets, other Greek practices. Cicero describes to Pætus[3] a dinner party (to which he went at the house of a Volumnius called *Eutrapelos*, or "the *Versatile*," in Greek), where were his friend Atticus and others, and a Greek courtesan (the host's mistress) named Cytheris. He anticipates Pætus' surprise, and says that he did not know that she would be present. But he excuses himself with a remark from Aristippus. Possibly this company also condescended to dance—a horrible opprobrium to a Roman gentleman, as Cicero admits when refuting the charge brought by Cato against Murena.[4]

There were again others who actually professed Pythagoreanism, like Nig. Figulus and the wretched Vatinius;[5]

---

[1] Cicero, *Orator*, 23, 30.

[2] *De fin.*, i, 9; *ibid.*, 4 *sq.*

[3] *Ad fam.*, ix, 62.

[4] *Pro Mur.*, 13.

[5] *In Vat.*, 14.

and there were the famous Roman Stoics, though in some of them, such as Tubero, we hear of traits which seem a stupid parody of Stoic principles. He served his share in the funeral feast to his uncle, Scipio Africanus, upon the commonest ware, and with the rudest appointments, as if the Cynic Diogenes, and not the splendid Africanus, were to be honoured. The public were justly indignant.[1]

So, then, among the Roman nobles, who almost all submitted to the tyrannous fashion of learning something of Greek philosophy, there were all the grades of intelligence, from that of L. Gellius to that of Cicero.

L. Gellius,[2] when he had come as proconsul after his prætorship into Greece, summoned all the philosophers then at Athens to meet together, and advised them seriously to make an end of their controversies. If they were really minded not to spend their lives in disputes, agreement was surely possible, and he promised them his assistance (as umpire) if they would strive to effect it! What charming innocence! Cicero, on the other hand, protests against his teachers, Philo and others, not insisting upon their differences from their rivals, and regards their attempts at any mediation among systems as a sign of weakness.[1] Philosophy had, in fact, become at Athens what it now is in our universities—no longer a rule of life, but a means of education in acuteness and in the practice of logical controversy.

---

[1] *Pro Murena*, 75: "Fuit eodem ex studio vir eruditus apud patres nostros, et honestus homo et nobilis, Q. Tubero. Is quum epulum Q. Maximus Africani patrui sui nomine populo Rom. daret, rogatus est a Maximo, ut triclinium sterneret, quum esset Tubero ejusdem Africani sororis filius. Atque ille, homo eruditissimus ac Stoicus, stravit pelliculis hædinis lectulos Punicanos et exposuit vasa Samia, quasi vero esset Diogenes Cynicus mortuus, et non divini hominis Africani mors honestaretur . . . . Hujus in morte celebranda graviter tulit populus Romanus hanc perversam sapientiam Tuberonis."

[2] Cicero, *de legg.*, i, 53.

[1] *De nat. deor.*, i, 16. I am tempted to give a modern Irish parallel. The 'Prentice boys and Roman Catholics of Derry maintain differences of opinion no less marked than did the Epicureans and Stoics. A few years ago a new Resident Magistrate boasted that he would allay the strife just as Gellius proposed to do, except that he would entertain the heads of the two factions at dinner in his club, and mollify them with champagne. His Irish friends acquiesced in his proposal with silent amusement. When the two *coryphæi* met at his table, they regarded him and one another with surprise, but controlled their feelings through dinner, even in spite of the champagne. But when after dinner he introduced the proposal to discuss quietly their differences, and come to an amicable settlement, one began charging the other with cowardice, treachery, etc., when challenged to fight. He asked with astonishment, when this encounter had taken place, imagining some recent riot which he ought to have known and quelled; whereupon they both glared at him with contempt and said: "1690!" (the date of the famous siege of Derry).

CHAPTER VIII

THE PERIOD OF THE ROMAN CIVIL WARS—FROM CICERO TO AUGUSTUS

Plutarch's *Life of Cimon* opens with a strange story, which will serve us as a text for the cruel days which are the subject of the present chapter. It is a bit of local history, which the biographer tells about his native place.

There was an ancient family descended from the seer Peripoltas, who had come with the first settlers from Thessaly, which had furnished many eminent members who fought and died in the Persian and Galatian wars. The hero of our story was, however, the last scion, an orphan, called Damon Peripoltas (as if he had a family name), excelling the rest of the youth in beauty and vigour, but uneducated, and gloomy in temper. This youth was tempted by a Roman commander who was wintering with his troops in Chæronea, and who did not disguise that he would use force when he failed with persuasion; "our native city," adds Plutarch, "being then in a bad way, and despised for its smallness and poverty." Damon, therefore, feeling outraged and dreading the results, made a conspiracy against this man with a few of his own fellows. The whole number, amounting to sixteen, blackened their faces with soot one night, and, having taken unmixed wine, fell upon the Roman at break of day, as he was sacrificing in the agora, and, having slain him and a good many of those about him, left the city. In the excitement that supervened, the senate of the Chæroneans came together and condemned the whole party to death, by way of an apology from the city to the Romans. But that evening, as the magistrates, according to custom, were dining together, Damon's party rushed into the town-hall and slew them, and fled away again.

Now, it happened that about this very time L. Lucullus was passing through with an army on some expedition. As the occurrence was quite fresh, he stopped his march, and, having made enquiry into the facts, found that the city had rather suffered than done wrong; so he simply withdrew the garrison and took it with him. But when Damon kept plundering their territory by constant raids and robberies, and persecuted the city, the citizens induced him, with friendly embassies and public resolutions, to return, and made him gymnasiarch; then, as he was anointing himself in the bathroom, they murdered him. For a long time after, as our fathers tell us, he haunted the place, till they built up the door of the room; and even now the neighbours believe they hear and see him at times. Those of his race that yet remain (particularly about Stiris in Phocis, speaking Æolic dialect) they call the "sooty" (ἀσβολωμένους), on account of Damon having blackened his face with soot when he was going to commit the murder.

But the neighbouring people of Orchomenos, who had a quarrel with the Chæroneans, hired a Roman sycophant, and he, treating the city as a single defendant, brought against it a charge of murdering those slain by Damon. The court was that of the prætor of Macedonia (for at that time there was not yet a prætor of Achaia), at which the counsel for the city appealed to the evidence of Lucullus, who replied to the prætor's letter, telling the whole truth, and thus saving the city from the most serious danger.

Accordingly, a statue of Lucullus was set up in Chæronea, which suggested to Plutarch this story.

We have here a sort of combination of what happens in Ireland and what has happened in Greece in our own times. Most murders have been committed in Ireland with blackened faces, and under the stimulus of strong drink; the habit of taking to the mountains to escape the law, and appealing to the sympathy of other outlaws and victims of what is considered tyrannous authority, is hardly yet out of fashion in most parts of southern Europe.

The events we have just related probably took place in 75–74 B. C., when the third Mithradatic war was commencing. It was a period when all the coasts were being devastated by corsairs, almost under the eyes of the very Lucullus just mentioned, the first Roman commander that attempted with any success to combat this scourge of the civilised world. The long and bloody war in Crete, carried on by Metellus in spite of the objections and resistance of Pompey, ended in the partial depopulation of that island and the subjugation of the last fragment of independent Hellenism. Many of the pirates were, indeed, settled in the deserted Dyme, and about Patræ in Achaia, but no such artificial and sporadic renewals of population could compensate for the heavier losses from war, from emigration, and from increasing poverty, which sapped the life-blood of most Hellenic lands.

The stray anecdotes preserved to us show that the more vigorous part of the population did not seek to reconquer the land gone out of cultivation, but rather to live by plunder, cursing their fate, and regarding the laws which restrained them as made unjustly to oppress the poor and the unfortunate. The details given by Cicero in his oration *For the Gabinian Law*, a measure which put all the coasts and islands under the autocratic power of Pompey, show that there was not wanting a feeling of race-hatred in these pirates, together with the ordinary love of plunder and lawlessness. In very many cases it was the Greek man revenging the loss of home and property upon his Roman conqueror. This may have been specially the case with the ravaging of Delos, now practically a great Roman mart in the Ægean. For not only was it plundered, but the temples were destroyed and the warehouses razed, although such ravages were no part of a pirate's policy, nay, even inconsistent with it.

We must also remember that, great as was the success of Pompey in restoring peace and security upon the seas,[1] every disturbance in the Roman world was followed by a new outburst of piracy. As highwaymen infested the roads, so the lately settled pirates of Dyme abandoned the dulness of an agricultural life, and left the vintage of their hills for the "unvintageable brine," as Homer called it, upon which they knew how to reap a plentiful harvest. The many extant allusions make it certain that the Cilicians bore away the palm for daring and adroitness in this traffic of violence and cruelty; and, as has already been explained, the ruin of the Hellenistic cities on the Syrian, and the decline of Rhodes upon the Carian, coasts, gave the pirates ample recruits from both these seaboards.

---

[1] It seems to me that he treated these marauders with too much clemency, probably with the short-sighted policy of obtaining new glory through the astonishing promptness of his great results. His pacification was accordingly complete at the moment, but not thorough; for the peaceable subjects were left without any recognition of their passive virtues, while the pirates were rewarded for abandoning their crimes. Cicero (*de off.*, iii, 11) expresses the cause of public discontent when he says: "Piratas immunes, socios vectigales habemus."

Yet it is hard to find any people who have ever been more ingrained pirates than the Greeks proper, whose serrated coast, rocky islands, and unexpected harbours, whose lofty promontories and seaside fortresses, invite every lawless member of the community to try his luck in this adventurous game. From Homer to Byron this natural instinct never died out, not even in the palmy days of the *pax Romana* and the general security of the world. Nor do I believe it would now be extinct but for the invention of steamers, which are too costly for the pirates to fit out, and which make the capture of their sailing-boats a certainty. I believe the Malay Archipelago presents, or presented lately, an aspect of insecurity very like that of the Levant in Græco-Roman days.

Had the settlement of Pompey been followed by a century of calm, it is possible that this deep-seated Greek vice might have been eradicated. But before twenty years had elapsed, all the East was in commotion at the tremendous conflict between Cæsarians and Pompeians, and every Greek must declare himself upon one side or the other—most of them did so for each party in turn, according as the fortunes of war oscillated. Four times within the century (including the invasion of Mithradates) was the Greek peninsula racked by these colossal conflicts, in which the Greeks were of no moment except to furnish a few soldiers and enormous requisitions; to amuse the victorious leaders with their plentiful wit and wisdom, their gushing laudations, their pompous decrees; to feed them with their scanty provisions, and to work for them like beasts of burden.

It is the business of the historian of wars and of policy to follow out the details of this wretched period, which did more than any other down to mediæval times for the degradation and disintegration of Hellenistic life. Its effects reached not only all the peninsula, but the nearer portions of Asia Minor and the islands, where Roman leaders demanded the advance of ten years' taxes, sacked towns, burnt fleets, and carried off sacred treasures. In their interludes these same men enjoyed themselves in the fashionable delights of Greek culture. Athens in particular was the scene of popular demonstrations which remind us of the days of Demetrius "the Thunderbolt."[1]

In the first Roman struggle, that of Cæsar and Pompey, it is remarkable that Athens was not the residence of either chief. The sympathies of Pompey lay further to the East, and his main support came from Asia. His philosopher-guide, Theophanes, came from Mytilene, and may have been jealous of the possible influence of Athenian rivals, if Pompey came within the fascination of that eternal city. Cæsar, on the other hand, though he had spent much of his youth in the East, and like all the Roman leaders knew the Hellenistic world well, is the first of them who dispensed with Greek private chaplains and panegyrists, and trusted to himself both for wisdom to act and literary power to chronicle his deeds. His *Memoirs* seem to me a calm and noble protest from the Roman magnate against the flattery, the tinsel, the unreality of the Greek rhetorician. His philosophy, so far as he professed any, was Epicurean, and that school did not usually afford tutors and counsellors to kings. But his strong Roman sense revolted against the Hellenistic sentimentality of his rival, and this probably gave him weight and dignity with many serious Romans—the more so, as he was able to make good with his own pen any supposed deficiency, and compose an account of his doings with a simplicity and gravity quite novel to the then world of letters. This contempt for what I will call sentimental Hellenism, combined with the large measures of relief and justice which he accorded to the maltreated Greeks,[1] as soon as his power was assured, is one of the most remarkable, though little noticed, features in the character and policy of the great dictator.

---

[1] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 86.

But if neither Cæsar nor Pompey dallied in Greece, as the eastern invaders had ever been prone to do, it was a very different thing with the sentimental Brutus and the luxurious Antony. Brutus spent the whole winter after the murder of Cæsar at Athens in re-organising the senatorial party from the remains of the Pompeians left in Macedonia, from the resources of the now loudly anti-Cæsarian Greeks, and from the legions and stores already in transit for the East, when Cæsar's plans had been arrested by his death. And we are told that Brutus' leisure hours were spent in discourse with the philosophers, who no doubt ransacked history to fortify his doubtful conscience with examples of virtuous tyrannicides. They even set up his statue beside those of Harmodius and Aristogiton, the imaginary founders of Athenian liberty.

---

[1] Thus he included 500 Greeks, probably of those resident in Italy, among the 5,000 Roman colonists whom he sent with full citizen rights to his new foundation at Como; cf. Strabo (v, 1. 6), who says these Greeks were the most distinguished of the townspeople. On the other hand, his foundation of the Roman colony at Corinth settled a Roman public, and not of the best sort, in Greece, and from this town such customs as gladiatorial shows were introduced elsewhere in Greece. I infer the character of these people from the remark of Strabo (viii, 6. 23), who tells us that on finding bronzes and ancient pottery in some of the tombs they ransacked every one they could find, and sold both bronzes and pottery (νεκροκορίνθια) for great prices at Rome, till the fashion changed. There is also an epigram ascribed to Crinagoras (No. 32, ed. Rubensohn) which complains bitterly of the class of men—twice-sold slaves—who now walked upon the ashes of the Bacchiadæ.

Unfortunately, we have very few details of Greek life, beyond these generalities, during this agitated period. We hear that when Cæsar's legate, Calenus, stormed Megara, after the battle of Pharsalia, the Pompeians let loose against him the lions which were then on their way to the Roman amphitheatre, and that they attacked both sides indiscriminately. They were, in fact, as impartial in their enmity as their Greek keepers were in their flattery towards the Romans.[1] We also hear that Dolabella on his way to Asia stopped at Argos to purchase a horse, which was descended from the horses of the Thracian Diomede, for which he paid 100,000 sesterces, but which brought all its successive owners fatal ill-luck.[2]

Far more interesting than these stray trifles is it to pause a moment before the character of Brutus, "the noblest Roman of them all," in the judgment of most of his contemporaries, but in that of history a very mischievous doctrinaire, who for the sake of a bug-bear of his own—his artificial horror of tyranny—inflicted perhaps the greatest mischief any one man ever inflicted upon his generation. In exact contrast to the practical directness of Cæsar, Brutus was constitutionally sentimental, as, for example, when he went to Naples to *persuade* Greek players to come to Rome, and asked his friends to secure for him in the same way a special actor, as it was wrong to coerce any Greek.[1] He constantly saved and pardoned his bitterest enemies in the civil war; yet he urged Cicero, as we know from the sixth book of the *Letters to Atticus*, to use proconsular authority in Cyprus on behalf of a villainous money-lender called Scaptius, who had tried to extract 48 per cent. from the Salaminians, together with compound interest, and had locked up the senate of Salamis in their council chamber, till five of them died of hunger. This villain was acting with the knowledge of Brutus, who protected and encouraged him, possibly in his own interest.

---

[1] These lions had been purchased by Cassius for display at his ædileship. Plutarch (*Brutus*, 8) repeats an absurd story that it was their loss which set Cassius against Cæsar.

[2] Aulus Gellius, iii, 9. 1.

After the first battle of Philippi, when he found his victorious army encumbered with a crowd of captives, in the face of the enemy, he ordered all the slaves among the prisoners to be massacred, while he liberated with polite speeches the freemen—a proceeding which Plutarch mentions without comment. But the same biographer relates with indignation that he promised his soldiers the sack of Thessalonica and Sparta, if they were victorious. And yet he rode up and down crying and wringing his hands before the town of Xanthus, where the inhabitants, to avoid capture and sacking by his troops, allowed their city to take fire, and committed suicide *en masse*. He offered rewards for the saving of their lives. For he was in theory a humane man and a philosopher, but distinctly of the Roman Stoic type, always talking philosophy in Greek, yet not apparently attached to any Greek sect, not even to the Stoics, who were clearly the people he should have joined. Plutarch specially[1] calls him a follower of Cato, and, so far as he was definite, a follower of the older Academy from Plato to Antiochus. He mentions[2] that at Athens he sought the company of Theomnestus the Academic, and Cratippus the Peripatetic, not of the Stoic school. All this points to his Roman eclecticism, even though he knew Greek perhaps better than any of his contemporaries.

---

[1] Plutarch, *Brutus*, 21.

Both the philosophy and the Hellenism of Brutus have a close resemblance to those of his model, the younger Cato. A comparison of the lives of both in Plutarch will, however, show that Cato was by far the stricter and more consistent Stoic, even to the verge of that coarse simplicity which parades meanness or indecency. His appointing of parsley crowns instead of the usual money prizes, when ædile, reminds us of the absurdity of Tubero,[3] and the account of his reception of the Cypriote Ptolemy at Rhodes savours rather of the vulgarest cynic than of a Roman gentleman.[4] He was trained by Antipater of Tyre, and afterwards took great pains to go and seek out Athenodorus at Pergamum and take him into his household.[5] But we must admit that he won his position at Rome by long-tried virtue rather than by a single crime. While his curiosity in visiting the East shows an educated taste, and his honesty and economy among the provincials were in all respects honourable, the simplicity of his appointments, and his habit of walking when all the rest rode, have a certain theatrical air about them which is even more obtrusive in the circumstances of his suicide. He, too, in contrast to Cæsar, had all his nearer intimates Greeks; so had Brutus, and so had Antony; hence these, and not Roman nobles, were the companions of each in his last moments.

---

[1] 2. [2] 24. [3] Above, p. 182. [4] *Cato*, 35. [5] *Ibid.*, x.

Cato made his great mistake in attempting to carry on the politics of this corrupt and violent time on Stoic principles. The tyrannicide idea, which Brutus was always parading with such ostentation, was not prominent in Cato's conversation, because he must have felt very clearly that, if Cæsar was assassinated, Antony would remain actual master of the state—probably a far worse autocrat. But these tyrannicide notions were imported from the writings of Greek aristocrats into the talk of Roman aristocrats, and were really the outcry against the loss of privileges and of license among nobles, rather than the genuine assertion of political liberty among the mass of the free population. This latter principle was put forward as a pretence and a cloak; what both Greek and Roman tyrannicides really resented was the rule of one man over the privileged classes, whom he levelled down to the inferior people. Thus when the tyrannicide Cassius, who shared with Brutus all the sentimental horrors of the republican against despotism, came to control and plunder Syria, he quickly forgot his vaunted principles. Josephus tells us of a certain Marion, whom Cassius had left as master over the Syrians; this man divided Syria into distinct tyrannies and so controlled it![1]

But in philosophy Cassius was a declared Epicurean, who (according to Plutarch) aired his notions in opposition to Brutus. His physical explanation of the tragic

[1] xiv, 12: τυραννίσι γὰρ διαλαβὼν τὴν Συρίαν οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐφρούρησε.

apparition of Brutus' evil genius is a curious piece of bathos. But the more serious differences of the two philosophical murderers were soothed by a third kind of dilettante, Marcus Favorinus, a passionate follower of Cato, "who did not philosophise by study so much as by some kind of impulse and mad passion." Brutus called him a mere Cynic and a sham one.[1]

On one point they all seemed to have agreed—on plundering the Greeks for the sake of their own civil war. Cassius especially acted with violence and cruelty. When the Rhodians resisted, he stormed their island town after defeating their fleet, and we hear that he robbed them of some £2,000,000 (in English money), nearly all of it private property;[2] and this gives us some notion of the comparative wealth of Rhodes and Athens at this period. Athens could send a fleet of only three ships to aid Antony at the battle of Actium. The plunder of Asia and the islands was so great that Brutus was able to lavish money on his troops during the final campaign, and it is quite possible that this frightful crisis, followed within ten years by the still more monstrous acquisitions of Antony, inflicted a financial blow never repaired by the Greeks of Hellas and the islands.

We have in Antony the old and vulgar style of phil-Hellene, who liked Greek life for its pleasures, and Greek society for the keener imagination of that people in providing entertainments, as well as for the more piquant flattery in which they were acknowledged masters. Plutarch justly brings Antony's *joieuse entrée* into Ephesus[1] and his debauches at Athens into comparison with the extravagances of King Demetrius the Besieger, which we have already noticed in a previous volume. At the same time, he did not scruple to use any of them as slaves, to carry burdens like mules, or to perform the most menial work. He stole three colossal statues by Myron from the Samians, of which Augustus restored[2] two. There was little Hellenistic culture in the man, though he liked Hellenistic pleasures.

---

[1] Cf. Plutarch, *Brutus*, 34–37, for the details.

[2] Eight thousand talents from requisition, five hundred more from the public funds (Plutarch, *Brutus*, 32).

Plutarch notices that he particularly favoured the Asianic style of rhetoric,[3] at that time very fashionable, and having a great analogy to his own life.[4] It is very interesting to find in one of his official letters to the Jews, cited by Josephus,[5] a passage which thoroughly corroborates Plutarch. Antony recites his recent victory at Philippi in these words, the effects of which can hardly be rendered in a translation:

> *Ἡμεῖς, ὡς οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἰδίου μόνον ἀγῶνος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων κοινοῦ, τοὺς αἰτίους καὶ τῶν εἰς ἀνθρώπους παρανομιῶν καὶ τῶν εἰς θεοὺς ἀνο-*

---

[1] *Antonius*, xxiv.

[2] Cf. *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. IX, p. 260.

[3] *Antonius*, 2. This is corroborated by Suetonius (*Octavius*, 86) when speaking of Augustus' purism. "M. quidem Antonium ut insanum increpat, quasi ea scribentem, quæ mirentur potius homines, quam intelligant. Deinde ludens malum et inconstans in eligendo genere dicendi ingenium ejus addit hæc: . . . . an potius Asiaticorum oratorum inanis sententiis verborum volubilitas in nostrum sermonem transferenda?" This shows that Antony's Greek studies had affected his Latin. Strabo (p. 523) mentions Dellius as the special historiographer of Antonius' Parthian war, therefore probably in Greek. Cf. Cic., *ad. fam.*, xii, 2.

[4] *κομπώδη καὶ φρυαγματίαν ὄντα καὶ κενοῦ γαυριάματος καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀνωμάλου μεστόν* (bombastic and frothy, and full of vain boasting and capricious ambition).

[5] *Antiq. Iud.*, xiv, 12. 3.

> μημάτων ἠμυνάμεθα δι' ἃ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἀπεστράφθαι δοκοῦμεν, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἀηδῶς ἐπεῖδε τὸ ἐπὶ Καίσαρι μῦσος. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς αὐτῶν τὰς θεομάχους, ἃς ὑπεδέξατο ἡ Μακεδονία, καθάπερ ἴδιος αὐτοῖς τῶν ἀνοσίων τολμημάτων ἀήρ, καὶ τὴν σύγχυσιν τῆς ἡμιμανοῦς κακοήθως γνώμης, ἣν κατὰ Φιλίππους τῆς Μακεδονίας συνεκρότουν, καὶ τόπους εὐφυεῖς καταλαμβανόμενοι μέχρι θαλάττης ἀποτετειχισμένους ὄρεσι, ὡς πύλῃ μιᾷ τὴν πάροδον ταμιεύσασθαι, τῶν θεῶν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀδίκοις ἐγχειρήμασι κατεψηφισμένων, ἐκρατήσαμεν.[1]

I need quote no more to show how truly Plutarch has spoken. The companion letters in the same chapter are much tamer, and do not show this peculiarity so strongly. Possibly that quoted may have been written before the excitement of the great victory had worn off, and by himself, while he entrusted to his secretaries the later and mere business letters.

The splendid and eccentric hospitalities of Cleopatra, the Egyptian queen, have made his life notorious. But though the brilliant Cleopatra, whose ancestors had now been thoroughly Hellenised for centuries, whose capital had long been the centre of Greek learning, had turned her great talents exclusively to practise the art of fascination, and was of course ready to take from Greek culture anything that could add grace or refinement to sensuality, though she spoke Greek perfectly, as all her house had done, yet the whole spirit of her court was Egyptian and oriental rather than Hellenistic.

It is plain that during this century the great work of Alexander suffered more than in any like period for a long time before or after. The rise of Roman importance turned the whole stream of Greek emigration westward; Antioch and Alexandria were no longer the El Dorado of the Greek fortune-hunter. I have already explained[1] how, ever since the ninth Ptolemy, Greek influence had waned even in Alexandria, and perhaps the only interesting personal story in Diodorus is his account how in this very generation (about 56 B. C.), when the Romans were greatly feared, and it was of the last importance to retain their favour, a Roman accidentally killed a cat; and how the fury of the populace at this crime against Egyptian religion was such that, though the offence was caused by an accident, though the king sent soldiers at once to protect the man from the mob, nothing could save his life. This anecdote seems to indicate that Alexandria was no longer a mainly Greek and Jewish city. The old tough race had been reasserting its ineradicable peculiarities.

---

[1] I apologise for giving so much Greek in the text, but I have tried in vain to reproduce the effect of this rhodomontade in English.

This is clearly the case if we compare generally the Egypt of the Ptolemies with the Egypt of the Romans. From the days of Augustus it was no longer the chief of Hellenistic lands, but a foreign and oriental country, full of natural wealth and of curiosities, but foreboding peculiar danger to the Empire from its isolated and defensible position, and from the fact that the strange enthusiasm of the old Egyptians might any day accept some saviour like the modern Mahdis, and rise in dangerous revolt. All this is non-Hellenistic, oriental, and essentially Egyptian. At Alexandria there was, of course, a good deal of the Ptolemaic tone left. The court spoke Greek still, and the uniforms and etiquette were the old Macedonian, long after Macedon had disappeared forever from the catalogue of nations. Watchwords and commands were no doubt still issued to the household guards in Macedonian, though the later kings had neglected to learn even this hereditary dialect, and had contented themselves with Greek. But it is significant that Cleopatra found it useful to speak Egyptian and Syrian as well as Greek, and this extraordinary accomplishment has been exaggerated into the statement that she could speak the languages of all her subjects, even of Troglodytes.[1]

---

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 506.

And yet, with all her fascinations, the occasional details we hear of her ordinary life show that her high culture did not include really refined manners. If the account of Josephus[2] be true, she offered herself with disgusting facility, whether from mere passion or policy, to other people than Antony, so that Herod could boast that he had rejected her addresses. The whole scene of her visit to Jerusalem, while Antony had gone upon his disastrous expedition against the Parthians, though told with matter-of-fact dulness by the historian, is perhaps the most dramatic in the romantic histories of the Jewish king and the Alexandrian queen. They were each in their way the representatives of that Syrian and Egyptian Hellenism which was accommodating itself to the Roman sway. Both were strikingly handsome, and versed in the arts of looking young;[3] both were persuasive and versatile. To these qualities both owed their power, created or established for them by the Romans. From Antony especially Herod had received his title of king and his dominion. But from Antony, too, the more potent Cleopatra had obtained the formal proclamation of her younger son Ptolemy as king of kings in Phœnicia, Syria, and Cilicia, and the boy had been produced to the people of Alexandria in the robes and Macedonian diadem of Syrian sovranty.[1] Hence her interests and Herod's were opposed, and the problem before each of them was how to preserve authority under Antony, or, if Antony fell, under his successor. Herod played the longer game, and won. But the scene at Herod's palace must have been inimitable. The display of counter-fascinations between these two tigers; their voluptuous natures mutually attracted; their hatred giving to each that deep interest in the other which so often turns to mutual passion while it incites to conquest; the grace and finish of their manners, concealing a ruthless ferocity; the splendour of their appointments—what more dramatic picture can we imagine in history?[2]

---

[1] I notice that our artists, who often take Cleopatra for their subject, always represent her a bronze-coloured Egyptian in the old national costume. Probably she was fair, and we may infer with certainty that she lived and dressed as a Greek, except on the state occasions, when she appeared as an Egyptian goddess.

[2] *Antiq. Iud.*, xv, 4. 2.

[3] I need not adduce evidence in the case of Cleopatra, but will quote Josephus (xvi, 8. 1) on Herod: *μελαίνοντα τὰς τρίχας, καὶ κλέπτοντα τὸν ἔλεγχον τῆς ἡλικίας* !

The prosaic Josephus adds that Herod consulted his council whether he should not put her to death for this attempt upon his virtue. He was dissuaded by them on the ground that Antony would listen to no arguments, not even from the most persuasive of the world's princes, and would take awful vengeance when he heard of her death. So she was escorted with great gifts and politenesses back to Egypt.

[1] Plutarch, *Antonius*, 54.

[2] It is much to be wondered at that Mr. Stephen Phillips did not bring this scene on the stage in his recent *Herod*.

Such, then, was the character of this notorious queen. But her violation of temples, and even of ancient tombs, for the sake of treasure, must have been a far more public and odious exhibition of that want of respect for the sentiment of others which is the essence of bad manners. Of the same kind were her violences to her attendants, whom she flew upon, beating them and tearing their hair even in the presence of the noblest Roman visitors.[1] When Octavian was sitting beside her, and she gave him a list of all her treasures, she used this violence to her steward, who said the list was incomplete; Cæsar smiled and restrained her. These details come from the memoirs of his confidential physician, Olympus.[2] This Hellenism then, even in queens, was far below the pure Hellenedom of earlier days, or even the teaching of the schools in Athens and Rhodes.

The same kind of outrage upon manners is exhibited in the tragic scene, told by Josephus,[3] when the condemned Mariamme, going in silence to her death, is assailed by her mother Alexandra, who thought to secure her own safety by reviling her unfortunate daughter. In addition to loud and calumnious accusations, she did not even refrain from tearing her daughter's hair! We cannot but feel that, though of royal descent, with a Greek name, and probably screaming out her abuse in Greek, there was here little more of Hellenism than a skin-deep varnish.

---

[1] Plutarch, *Antonius*, 83.

[2] *Σελεύκου δέ τινος τῶν ἐπιτρόπων ἐλέγχοντος ὡς ἔνια κρύπτουσαν καὶ διακλέπτουσαν ἀναπηδήσασα καὶ τῶν τριχῶν αὐτοῦ λαβομένη πολλὰς ἐνεφόρει τῷ προσώπῳ πληγάς.*

[3] *Antiq. Iud.*, xv, 7. 5.

To return to Egypt.

The court of its marvellous queen can hardly be called either strictly Hellenistic or Egyptian; for she sought what was fascinating from all quarters, and was probably more cosmopolitan in her tastes than any one who had as yet appeared in the Hellenistic world. Beyond the court, together with the decaying Museum and the Greek trade in the port, we know of nothing but the reassertion of the old nationality. The revolt and devastation of Thebes which took place under Ptolemy Lathyrus about 85 B. C., and from which that wonderful city never recovered,[1] would at first seem an assertion of Alexandrian ideas against the old traditions and claims of the natives. But the result was probably the very reverse. Whatever cosmopolitan culture—Greek or Roman—might creep into a great Egyptian city far up the Nile by way of trade or garrison would never reach ruined palaces, or the villages which held the remains of the population. The Egyptians became more and more a mere agricultural peasantry, with no great centre in Upper Egypt (for Ptolemaïs was wholly Greek), and so sank gradually into the position of the Indian ryot or other free labourer, who is practically a slave to earn taxes for his rulers.

The peculiar religious and philosophic developments at Alexandria which came just before, and with the rise of, Christianity will be discussed in due season.

Let us now turn to Syria and Asia Minor. The long quarrels and wars of the wretched Seleucid princes and princesses at last produced in the most loyal of the

---

[1] Mr. Sayce informs me that on the *ostraca* he has collected in Egypt, Thebes (Diospolis) is called a μητρόπολις till this time; afterwards it is cited as consisting merely of villages (κῶμαι).

Syrians a conviction that any foreign rule would be better than this constant and bloody confusion. As Egypt was exactly in the same difficulties, there seemed no possibility of obtaining a proper regent from that quarter, and the Romans had already shown their harsh and grasping character in the East. So it seems that the Armenian and Parthian sovran Tigranes was invited or permitted to occupy the throne peaceably for about eighteen years.[1] Then came his connection with the Mithradatic wars, and the conquests of Lucullus, ending in the settlement of Pompey, by which Syria was taken from Tigranes and from the remaining Seleucids, and made a Roman province. This settlement rehabilitated all the isolated cities within the limits of Syria. Josephus specially tells us that the coast cities, such as Gaza, which Alexander Jannæus had destroyed, as well as the inland cities, such as Scythopolis, were all declared free of Jewish or Syrian rule; if they were held by tyrants, which was the case with some of them, these tyrants were dispossessed; if they were ruined, they were given to their exiled inhabitants to rebuild. For the isolated Greek city was the form of polity apparently best understood by Rome and most convenient for distant dependencies. Nevertheless, the rapacity and tyranny of the Roman governors made this change less beneficial than would at first sight appear.

We have, unfortunately, no picture of Syrian Hellenistic life at this period. Except that many philosophers, grammarians, and epigrammatists come from the coast is little sign of any stirring intellectual and from this time to the establishment of the All the Roman decrees cited in the fourteenth osephus' *Antiquities* were to be engraved and set up in Roman and Greek, not in any local idiom, such as Syriac. It is everywhere assumed in that book that the Jewish people perfectly understand Greek, though very few could write it correctly. The names of almost all their public men are also Greek.

---

[1] We now have an excellent sketch of the conflict of Hellenistic and Oriental ideas in Mr. Bevan's valuable *House of Seleucus*, Vol. II, pp. 262 *sq.*

The requisitions of the Roman party leaders were, of course, here as elsewhere very oppressive. Still worse, the civil wars entailed a neglect of the frontier, and after the great victory over Crassus the Parthians kept invading, not only Syria, but Asia Minor, with impunity. Cæsar was preparing to conquer them when he was assassinated, but in the years immediately succeeding they penetrated through Asia Minor and actually reached the Ægean.[1] The victories of Ventidius, the lieutenant of Antony, were followed by the graver defeat of Antony himself, so that the Roman sway over Syria was often interrupted and always precarious. In these frequent Parthian raids the Greek cities suffered great loss, and doubtless many more Greeks were carried off as slaves into the interior of Asia. A certain varnish of Hellenistic culture extended even to the Parthian court, as the celebrated story of the appearance of the head of the Crassus at a Greek play in Parthia implies. But I think the weight of this piece of evidence is overrated.[2] Our whole knowledge of the Arsacid power tells us that it was distinctly oriental and non-Hellenistic, quite different from that of the Seleucids, perhaps even from that of Tigranes.[1]

---

[1] The inscriptions of Stratoniceia in Caria imply this disastrous invasion; cf. *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 156.

[2] Cf. above, p. 35.

On the other hand, the really Hellenistic cities of the East were now affected, or infected, with a Roman element, which seriously altered their complexion in politics, art, and manners. Pompey had already posed as a great founder of cities in the East—cities, indeed, after the Hellenistic model, but with names derived from himself and his conquests, sometimes with a population increased from his own veterans, and probably in every case looking to Rome, and not to Antioch or Alexandria, as the real model of a city.[2] Still more was the Italic element strengthened in some of them by the fact that Roman communities were settled in them—a population apart from, and certainly not inferior to, the Greeks. Such was the case with Nicopolis, Sinope, Byzantium, and others.[3] As I have already noted, all the decrees issued by Roman generals at this time in Syria were published in Latin and in Greek, and thus there arose and grew that peculiar fusion which afterwards marked the civilisation of the Empire.[4]

The coryphæus of this movement in the East, the most interesting Hellenistic figure of the day, who stands alone, with Cleopatra, above the vulgar herd of worthless dynasts, in versatility, in daring, and in consequent success, was the Idumæan Herod, whose earlier life, which falls within our period, fills the fourteenth and fifteenth books of Josephus' *Antiquities.* The wonderful adventures and vicissitudes of this clever upstart, his gradual rise to power upon the ruins of the Asmonæan house, his cruel domination over the Jews, are all matters of well-known history. But beyond the fact of his success, the manner of it is strangely interesting. He must clearly have been the most fascinating of men. Whenever his crimes or the hostility of the conservative party and of the legitimate royal house brought him into imminent danger; whenever his foes expected that his fall at the hands of the Roman governor was certain, his visit to headquarters as an already condemned criminal turned out the occasion for new extension of his territory, for new privileges, for new favours. He is reported to have bribed Gabinius, Antony, Cleopatra, and others in turn. Of course he did so. But anybody else could adopt this vulgar and obvious means of persuasion. He must have added some singular eloquence of words or of manner, some extraordinary plausibility, to win so many desperate causes. His military career was very similar. Sometimes defeated, often in great difficulties, his unwearied resource, his obstinate courage, his popularity with his mercenaries, made him recover lost battles, and reduce his enemies' victories to successes in unsuccessful campaigns.

---

[1] This is now shown in Mr. V. A. Smith's *Early History of India*, where the Hellenism of the far East is reduced to its real dimensions.

[2] Cf. on this settlement, and on the new or newly enlarged cities of the East, Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. III, pp. 152 *sq.*

[3] Thus in the old piratical forts of the Alpine Isauria, we have in an inscription: Ἰσαυρέων ἡ βούλη καὶ ὁ δῆμος οἵ τε συμπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι (*BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 67).

[4] It is in this sense only that the eulogy of Augustus in Philo (*leg. ad Caium*, 22), is true: ὁ τὴν μὲν Ἑλλάσι Ἑλλάδα πολλοῖς παραυξήσας, τὴν δὲ βάρβαρον ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις τμήμασιν ἀφελληνίσας.

But what makes him far more interesting to us than all his wars and his wiles is the story of his love. Married to Mariamme, the most splendid beauty of her day, he seems really to have gained the affection of this princess of the house he had dethroned, but the passion that dominated him made her feel secure, and too outspoken in her contempt for his mother and sister, whom she derided as ignoble. The king was so completely devoted to her that even the irresistible Cleopatra, who tried to seduce him, only met with contempt, and would have lost her life at his hands but for the dictates of prudence, as I have just narrated.[1]

Josephus quotes his facts from Herod's own *Memoirs*, which gave a more favourable account of the king than was contained in independent histories.[2] How interesting must these *Memoirs* have been! We wonder what account he gave in them of the tragedy with Mariamme; or did he omit all domestic matters as beneath his dignity? His furious jealousy led him gradually not only to suspect every intimate of his pure and noble wife, but to take the odious precautions of an oriental despot, lest upon his death she should survive and pass into the possession of another man. Her discovery of these precautions led to bitter recriminations, abject repentance on Herod's side, reconciliations, and new estrangements. The story of the pathetic preludes to her death make the pages of the tame historian glow with lurid splendour. When at last the schemes of her female enemies succeeded, and she was condemned to death at the demand of Herod, her calm dignity and silence left in his heart the indelible conviction of his own injustice, and the stings of a remorse heightened to madness by the unspeakable misery of his self-inflicted bereavement. His great passion for Mariamme returned with such a storm into his soul that his reason as well as his health were shattered. All attempted distractions proved vain, and for months he lay a mere wreck in the hands of his despairing physicians in Samaria.

---

[1] Above, p. 200.

[2] *Antiq. Iud.*, xv, 6. 3: *ταῦτα δὲ γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως* 'Ηρώδου *περιείχετο.*

Let me quote the words of Josephus:

> But after she was executed, the king's passion was inflamed even beyond the condition we have already described. For his love was not calm, or such as arises from companionship, but had begun with enthusiasm, and was not prevented by the outspokenness of married life from growing stronger every day. So then it appeared that he had been set on to destroy her by some divine retribution, and oft would he call upon her by name, oft fall into unseemly lamentation, though he also devised all possible beguilements for his soul, making convivial nights and entertainments his serious pursuit. But none of these things availed him. He then abandoned the administration of his kingdom to others, and was so overcome with this calamity as actually to order his attendants to call Mariamme, as if she were alive and could respond. At this time there supervened a pestilence, which carried off much people and the majority of his most honoured peers, and was interpreted by public opinion as the visitation of Providence for the outrage done upon his queen. This, too, had a grave effect upon the king, and at last betaking himself to the deserts, and wandering about there distraught, under the pretext of hunting, after some days he fell into a dreadful sickness—fever and inflammation of the neck, with loss of reason; nor were any of the usual remedies effective, except to intensify the disease and drive his attendants to despair.

At last his doctors, in perplexity, allowed him whatever he desired, leaving his recovery to chance. In this condition he lay sick in Samaria.[1]

It was after this tragic episode of his life had passed that he succeeded in conciliating at Alexandria the final conqueror in the civil wars, and received from Augustus the confirmation and extension of his royal position. Then it was that he undertook to rebuild and adorn Jerusalem, and presently Cæsarea, in accordance with the ideas of the day. The later history of Herod falls under the Empire. But here we have already full-blown that new type of which I have spoken—Hellenism coloured with Roman habits, modified by Roman tastes, not from any real admiration, but because it was politic, nay even necessary, to conciliate and flatter the rulers of the earth.

Having slain the last remnants of the legitimate high-priest's ruling family, Herod proceeds thus:

> Whereupon he departed yet further from the national customs, and kept corrupting the old order of things with new fashions, because he could not control them; and this did us no small harm even in succeeding times, as those things became neglected which led the common people to religion. For first he established a five years' feast of athletic contests in honour of Cæsar, and built a theatre in Jerusalem, and again, on the plain beneath, an enormous amphitheatre, both of them remarkable for their splendour, but foreign to Jewish customs; for the use of them, and such exhibitions, are against our traditions. He thereupon celebrated his five years' feast with great splendour, having announced it round about, and invited people of every nation. Athletes and other performers were induced to come from every land by the promise of valuable prizes, and the reputation of so famous a competition, and so the best of all kinds were secured. For very valuable rewards were offered, not

---

[1] *Antiq. Iud.*, xv, 7. 7.

> only for gymnastics, but for musical skill. He also offered prizes for races with four, two, or single horses; and whatever devices had elsewhere been adopted to exhibit riches and splendour, these he carefully imitated from motives of ambition. Round the theatre were medallions of Cæsar, and trophies of the nations conquered by him, wrought in pure gold and silver. In robes, too, and precious stones, there was nothing too splendid to be lavished upon the decoration. There was a large provision of wild beasts—quantities of lions and other animals of exceptional strength or rarity, and these were set to fight with each other, or with condemned criminals.
>
> The visitors were astonished with this extravagance, and delighted with the excitement of these conflicts, but to the natives they seemed a manifest violation of ancient traditions, for it was clearly impious to cast men to wild beasts for mere amusement; impious, too, to supplant the Law with strange ordinances. But what vexed them most of all were the trophies, as they regarded the figures surrounded by the arms as images.[1]

The historian goes on to explain how Herod was obliged to take particular pains to get rid of this difficulty! His murders, his espionage, and his exactions seemed to his people far less shocking.

In addition to this readornment of Jerusalem, ultimately condoned by the Jews, owing to his splendid rebuilding and magnifying of the great temple some years later,[2] Herod built two more Hellenistic centres,[3] wherein to show both his architectural fancies and his profound veneration for the emperor—Sebaste (which was the Greek for Augusta), on the site of the old Samaria, and Cæsarea on the coast, where he constructed a large artificial harbour—a seaport, as it were, for his capital, on a coast singularly devoid of any natural refuge for ships. The details of this great work are minutely described by Josephus; and, indeed, such enterprises must have gratified the peculiar ambition of Herod to be known as a munificent builder. For he was in the habit, when he visited Asia Minor, of giving large sums to various cities to set up *stoas*, temples, and other public edifices. He set up again the ruined *stoa* of Chios,[1] and showered benefits on Ephesus, Samos, and Ilium. He was the mediator with Agrippa for many supplications from these cities, and often obtained for them a remission of burdens.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, xv, 8.

[2] By the way, with Corinthian pillars (*ibid.*, xv, 11. 5).

[3] When the Jews sent an embassy to Rome after his death to protest against the oppressions of Archelaus, his successor, a special complaint against the rule of Herod was that he adorned and favoured outlying Greek towns, to the loss and detriment of his Jewish subjects. Josephus, *op. cit.*, xvii, 11. 2: *πόλεις μέν γε τὰς μὲν περιοικίδας, καὶ ὑπ' ἀλλοφύλων οἰκουμένας κοσμοῦντα μὴ παύσασθαι, καταλύσει τε καὶ ἀφανισμῷ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτοῦ κατῳκημένων.*

In all this Hellenistic work he had beside him as his teacher, his "ancient," his adviser, Nicolaus of Damascus, one of the most prolific authors of that day, who is reported to have done much to whitewash Herod's reputation. In an interesting fragment from the autobiography of Nicolaus[2] he tells how Herod got tired of philosophy, and made him set to work at rhetoric. Presently Herod got weary of rhetoric, and took to history. It was the necessity of working up history with Herod that set Nicolaus to extend his own studies until he composed a great general history, which, he says, is a labour which would have puzzled Heracles, if Eurystheus had chosen to set it before him. It is specially mentioned of this Nicolaus that he openly boasted of being from Damascus, whereas rival teachers were often anxious to acquire the citizenship of some famous city, and then drop their native place. This by the way.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, xvi. 2. 2.

[2] Müller, *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, Vol. III, p. 350

I will conclude with the significant passage in which Josephus explains the policy of this remarkable philo-Roman sovran:

> By his ambition in doing these good offices, and the constant court which he paid to Cæsar and the most influential Romans, he was compelled to transgress Jewish customs, and to infringe much of the law, building cities through ambition, and setting up temples—not in Judæa, for they would not there have been tolerated, as they were erected in honour of images after the Greek fashion. But he did this beyond the boundaries, making as his excuse to the Jews that he did it not of his own accord, but according to command for Cæsar and the Romans, really preferring their favour to that of his own people, and all the while promoting his ambition to leave signal evidences of his own greatness.[1]

Such is the character of this very remarkable personage, who represents the progress of the new Hellenism among a people above all others stern and uncompromising in their Semitism. But this brings us already under the shadow of the Roman Empire, and close to the origin of that great religion which made Greek its expression and its vehicle throughout the civilised world. Thus another epoch in our subject opens before us, and we must not here enter upon this fresh and no less arduous task.

---

[1] *Antiq. Iud.*, xv, 9. 5.

CHAPTER IX

ASCETIC RELIGION IN THE FIRST CENTURY

It will be a proper introduction to the great spiritual regeneration which took place in the next century, as well as an antidote to the worldly, immoral, and superficial Hellenism of Herod, if we consider that development of mystic asceticism which invaded the whole Hellenist-Roman world in the first century before Christ, and showed itself prominently, not only in numerous writings, but in distinct societies, and in the ordinances of a higher spiritual life. I allude chiefly to the Pythagoreans and their rivals, the Essenes.

The habit of turning from the worn-out, artificialised systems of latter days to the fresher, vaguer, more poetical guesses of older thinkers had long since prevailed among Hellenistic philosophers. The Stoics and Epicureans turned away from Plato and Aristotle, and went back to the enigmas of Heracleitus and the assumptions of Democritus for their physics. They seemed to have no more ability to frame a new system than our modern architects have to design a new style. No field seems to remain for the originality of either profession, save to borrow from some model more obsolete than the rest, or to combine the ideas of various older schools in some novel way. In the century we have been studying, the Stoic, Epicurean, and Academic systems had become as threadbare as were the older rational systems of Plato and Aristotle in the third century B. C. Positive scepticism had been administered plentifully as a cure for both dogmatism and doubt, and, as usual, had proved at first attractive, then tedious, at last disgusting, like some new and piquant food, wherewith one might try to supplant that plain household bread of ordinary life which lasts through fashions and tastes, and remains the support of man in preference to anything seasoned or sweetened by artifice.

Nothing, therefore, remained but to return to some other ancient system, either of religion or of philosophy, which had satisfied the men of other days and other lands, and see whether sustenance could there be found for the spiritual hunger of mankind. Oriental religions, as we know, came much into fashion, and among the Greeks those orgiastic worships were sought out which savoured most of mystery and of inspiration. The worship of the Phrygian Cybele, with her cymbals and her shawms, her orgies and revivals, replaced the sober offering and quiet prayer to Hera or Athene.

Recent research into the inscriptions at Delos and at Samothrace, the great homes of Hellenic religion in the Ægean, have put this growth of oriental influences beyond all doubt. I will not set down as certain the theory of M. Foucart, that every private religious association among the Greeks, all those ὀργεῶνες and θίασοι of *Dionysiasts*, and other *-asts* which recur so frequently in the inscriptions, were under the protection of a deity really imported from the East, even though frequently disguised under a Hellenic name.[1] But from the days when Corinth was destroyed and Delos rose to be a great commercial, as well as religious, centre, the number of dedications by eastern princes, such as those of Pontus, Cappadocia, and even the Parthian Arsaces, as well as allusions to strange oriental gods in offerings and vows, increases so rapidly that we feel ourselves hardly in a Hellenic place of worship. The same change is said to be noticeable in the votive offerings and dedications recovered in Samothrace.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Foucart, *Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, p. 109, and Professor Dill's *Social Life from Nero, etc.*

It was the same spirit in the more cultivated minds of the day which led them back to the theological, mystical, supra-sensible doctrine of Pythagoras, with its vague conceptions of harmony as a law of the universe, its worship of order, its spirituality in conceiving the Godhead, its asceticism as the highest of earthly conditions. The original teaching of the sage of Samos was, indeed, almost completely lost; there survived but scanty and vague traditions,[2] which served as sparks to rekindle the flame of this higher light. And, perhaps, such faintness of tradition was even favourable to the preachers of the revived truth, for they were not only enabled to supply from Plato and the Stoics many conceptions undeveloped or unrecognised by the real Pythagoras, but they were also able to produce them under the guise of ancient lore, recovered from oblivion in the supposed fragments of Archytas, Ocellus, and other venerable names.

There was a whole library of such literature, beginning with the first century B. C., from which fragments of some ninety authors are still extant. They preach the unity and pure spirituality of the Highest, who contains within Himself the seeds of the universe, of which the world and the stars are the lesser gods, with a life of their own derived from his substance. In a huge metaphor, "The gods are his laughter, the race of mortal men his tears." The laws of numbers are the principles upon which all the order and beauty of existence are based. Whether the absolute spirituality of God could be reconciled with His diffusion through every element of the universe as its living principle did not trouble them. They taught both doctrines, perhaps, in turn, helping man to form some inadequate notion of His perfections. For this was their main object—to supply the wearied age, not with a system more logical and consecutive than those that went before, but rather with higher emotions, with deeper comfort, with nobler aspirations. They maintained the eternity of the world, and consequently of the human species, whose souls were but a lower grade of intelligence, above which the demons or genii, inhabiting the air, formed the link between them and the astral gods. To these demons was entrusted the detail of the government of our world.

---

[1] Cf. Th. Reinach in *BCH.*, Vol. VII, p. 348; and Foucart, *ibid.*, p. 467.

[2] ζώπυρα ἄττα πάνυ ἀμυδρὰ καὶ δυσθήρατα, is the expression of Iamblichus, usually quoted (cf. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, Vol. III, Part 2, p. 112).

But far more interesting to us than their physics is their practical philosophy. In direct contrast to the elaborate reasoning, the minute controversy, the subtle distinctions of the other schools, these Pythagoreans and their kindred sects believed first of all in purity and soberness of life, as the proper training for that deeper insight which is the appanage of goodness. It was by doing the will of God that they would learn to know His doctrine.

And this knowledge was not a logically reasoned-out doctrine, but a moral insight, a higher intuition, which not only told them the right way, but even attained to a prophetic foresight of future events. Exceptional holiness produced exceptional wisdom, and the demons who governed the world were willing to reveal hidden things to such admirable obedience.

From this came the ascetic aspect of life—attributed freely to the original Pythagoras in the later documents of this age—the institution of an almost monastic brotherhood, which refused to take oaths, to sacrifice animals or eat them,[1] to drink wine, or in other ways to pander to the lusts of the flesh. It is further to be observed that the main preaching of this doctrine is not in the formal tracts which have been preserved (at least in copious extracts), but in the portraits of the ideal men, Pythagoras, and afterwards Apollonius of Tyana. The official descriptions of the Pythagorean theory contain very little that is original, and are only an eclectic combination of well-known Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic views. Even among these Aristotle is at least as prominent as Plato.[2]

To set up for imitation the picture of a perfect life seems to have been the real teaching of this school. Not only the clear separation from the ordinary world, but the high principles of serving God with the spirit, and not with sacrifice; of self-examination, and of justice, positive as well as negative, to our neighbour; of silent contemplation of the perfections of God and his world—these were the attributes of the Pythagorean ideal, which was not, like the Stoic Wise Man, an abstraction, but realised in more than one definite historical figure.

---

[1] The older Pythagoreans permitted eating of flesh of animals sacrificed to the gods; cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, Vol. II.

[2] Cf. the discussion in Zeller, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, Part 2, pp. 127 *sq.*

In giving this general description of the doctrine which marks the first century B. C., I have as yet said nothing of the particular country in which it arose, and it may be thought doubtful whether it really belongs to the history of Hellenism. There seem at first sight very un-Greek, very oriental, features about it, and two of its centres, so far as we know them, were on the outskirts of the Greek world. Nevertheless, Pythagoras himself, whatever his education may have been, was a Hellene of the Hellenes, and taught Greeks in Greek; and he was truly a more tangible model for the new school than any oriental sage known to us. Moreover, all the evidence we have concerning this school is either in Greek or taken from Greek sources; so that there can be no ultimate doubt of the Hellenistic complexion of this new phase in the world's thinking.

Our evidence points to two actual homes of the neo-Pythagorean faith—Italy and Judæa; and we know from very good internal evidence that the former, if not the latter, must have learned it from Alexandria, which was still the real centre of the world's deeper thinking. For though Cicero, probably with justice, speaks of his friend P. Nigidius Figulus as the reviver of Pythagoreanism in Italy,[1] we can say with certainty that no new school could have originated at Rome without Greek lessons, and the

[1] He used to say that all the successful acts of his consulship were done under the emulation and with the advice of this Pythagorean philosopher (Plutarch, *an seni*, 27 *sub fin.*, and also Cicero's letter to him, *ad fam.*, iv, 3). Cf. the account in Zeller, *loc. cit.*, pp. 93 *sq.*

numerous fragments quoted by Stobæus and others from Greek books of this age show plainly enough whence came the new inspiration. We hear also from Philo of a sect settled on Lake Mareotis, called Therapeutæ, who professed in general the principles of cenobitic life, and we know that they had before them earlier Egyptian practices of the same kind. There are extant many petitions to Ptolemy Philometor from a man who had voluntarily confined himself for years in the Serapeum at Memphis—men and women seeking to purify themselves by avoiding the temptations of the world.[1]

We do not hear of any such practical working-out of this new faith at Rome.[2] Probably it was confined to a few enthusiasts like Nigidius, who took up the prophetic and wonder-working side of it; or to sceptics like Varro, who learned it only as a matter of speculative curiosity. But in the very different climate and spiritual atmosphere of Judæa there arose a movement, the Essene, so analogous to the Egyptian that it still remains a matter of controversy whether it may not be traced directly to the influence of Greek ideas on Jewish religion. The information we have is almost exclusively from Josephus, who does not give us any account of the dawn or growth of this school—that of the Essenes—but speaks of it as in full development at the end of the second century B. C. He has turned aside from his narrative twice to describe pretty fully this remarkable heresy among his people. I call it a *heresy*,[1] for the Essenes objected on principle (like the Pythagoreans) to bloody sacrifices, and were accordingly excluded by the orthodox Jews from the temple at Jerusalem. But even this stigma does not seem to have deterred them from forming a schismatic society on the inner slopes of the mountains near Hebron, where there dwelt together in number about four thousand.

---

[1] Cf. the account given in Delaunay's *Moines et Sibylles*, pp. 17 *sq.* There is ample evidence in the papyri from the Serapeum at Memphis written in the days of Ptolemy VII, and preserved in various museums (Paris, London, etc.), which contain the correspondence of Ptolemy, son of Glaucias, one of these recluses.

[2] The very limited school of the Sextii may be a qualified exception (cf. Zeller, *loc. cit.*, Part 1, pp. 677 *sq.*).

The fullest account which we possess is in the *History of the Jewish War*,[2] and I cannot but feel that Josephus wrote this account with the view of magnifying the philosophic genius of his nation. Though he compares the Essene belief in a happy elysium for the souls of good men to the Islands of the Blest in Greek mythology, and though he says that these sectaries were most diligent in searching out the lore of ancient writings, he implies clearly that these were not ancient Mosaic books, but others which were carefully kept from the outer public. These books, in fact, and the names of the angels, were among their chief mysteries. His account of their practical life of piety, charity, and community of goods is so closely analogous to the life of the first Christian church at Jerusalem that we can hardly conceive the two systems to be wholly independent. But the Essene reverence for the sun, whose rising they saluted with some kind of adoration, before which they would undertake no kind of work, and their concealment of their sacred books, point in my mind clearly to a foreign source. So do the abhorrence of oil, which they regarded as polluting, and the aversion to bloody sacrifices. The latter was, no doubt, to be found in the later Pythagoreanism of Greece; but what shall we say to the hatred of oil?

---

[1] We find the word *αἵρεσις* used in Greek papyri for any school or followers of a master without implication of false doctrine or, indeed, of any doctrine.

[2] ii, 8.

These, and other points which would require too long a discussion, incline me to take the side of those who in this difficult controversy assume that direct influences from the East produced this remarkable Jewish asceticism. We know that the Buddhists in their early inscriptions claim to have preached their gospel to Antiochus, Antigonus, and Ptolemy.[1] It may, therefore, be assumed as certain that Buddhist missionaries had come as early as the third century B. C. into Syria. Whether they founded some sort of school in Galilee or the mountains of Judæa, which gave the tone to the after-developments of religion in this home of creeds, will, perhaps, remain forever a matter of surmise; but surely the probabilities are in its favour. Josephus, of course, desires to magnify the originality of his people, and to show that they had anticipated the philosophical discoveries of the Greeks. We may, therefore, suspect that the neo-Pythagorean features of Essenism are not given in faint colours, but rather brought out more prominently than the facts warranted. Yet, even so, there is much in his account not easy to reconcile with the Alexandrian origin, which Zeller inclines to adopt, nor do I think that national Jewish features can account for the non-Pythagorean side of the system.

It is not within the province of this book to enter into the oriental side of the sects. What has been said is sufficient at least to vindicate for Hellenism at this moment a deep and striking practical development. In the face of those who repeat the statement that the Greek mind was always spiritually superficial and thoughtless, we must insist upon this, that in these latter days it eagerly took up the solemn ideas developed by the world's experience; and that, if the Stoics had indeed received some stimulus from the East, it was no new or peculiar effect, seeing that Pythagoras either exhibits an original Greek development of what is considered the Semitic tone, or else illustrates the suitability of eastern to Greek thought even in very ancient times. Need I add the long roll of serious and noble Greeks—Hellenes of the Hellenes—who were pure without the profession of purity, and lofty without the clouds of mystery—Anaxagoras, Xenocrates, Cleanthes, *primi inter pares?*

---

[1] Cf. above, p. 23.

The present age, however, made Roman-Greek men acquainted with sundry ideas which long afterwards came to dominate the world. First of all, there is the teaching of morality by holding up the life and acts of an ideal person—a method far more effective than repeating precepts and expounding dogmas. Secondly, the notion of separation from the world, from the society of average human beings, for the purpose of living a stricter and holier life, and hence the notion of a spiritual aristocracy, of which the old Pythagorean brotherhood in Magna Græcia seems to have been the earliest model. Thirdly, we find the belief spreeding that logic, discursive thinking, debate, and controversy, which had long been thought the only path to higher knowledge, were, after all, but clumsy methods, which killed the inner life of religion by dissecting its organism. Moral purity, ascetic contemplation, direct spiritual intuition, gave the clearest and highest knowledge of the mysteries of God and of the human soul.

It will, perhaps, be urged that these profound novelties must, indeed, be foreign to Hellenism, as they took no root at Athens or at Rhodes, the real foci of its culture. Such an inference, however, does not seem to me warranted. Old universities with fixed chairs professing traditional knowledge are the very last to adopt new ideas. Every established church regards novelties of doctrine as dissent and schism from the truth. It seems that even at Alexandria, the hot-bed of new and semi-Hellenistic creeds, the Museum or University was not the field for these speculations; they were probably discountenanced and even opposed by the fellows and professors of that ancient and respectable seat of learning. Aristotelian science, aggrandised by many noble developments in astronomy and physics, was still the knowledge expounded by the accredited men of learning, and the last persons likely to join the Therapeutæ would have been the Dons of the Museum. The revelation, as usual, was to babes, not to the wise and prudent. And the revelation was sporadic, accepted indeed with enthusiasm by scattered groups of serious people through the world, but scorned and neglected by the majority, and by those who clung to the teaching of the schools. Such was the condition of the thinking world at the opening of that great period of rest and peace, called the Augustan age, but in the provinces rather the Imperial age, which established good order in the civilised world for two hundred years.

CHAPTER X

WESTERN HELLENISM UNDER THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE—COLONISATION

We now arrive at a period when materials of a certain kind come freely to hand, but unfortunately not the sort of materials we require. The Augustan age has a great reputation in the world as an age of peace and of culture, but rather of Roman culture than of Greek, and not only of peace, but of political and literary stagnation in the provinces. There were, of course, literary men left, and we have from them some of the longest and most important of our Greek books, but these men are isolated, generally wanderers over the world, making at Rome their principal sojourn, at Alexandria their second—in fact, citizens of the world, while they still take care to name and to love their birthplace. Such are Diodorus the Sicilian, and Strabo the Cappadocian, whose encyclopædic works exhibit strongly both the merits and the defects of the prose-writing of that age.

Diodorus tells us very little about himself, and his work is so strictly a compilation from older books that there is seldom any personal experience to be found in his remains, such as the anecdote already quoted.[1] Strabo is more communicative, and tells us of his family, of their intimate relations to the kings of Pontus, of which he is proud, of his own studies and travels, and also of his opinions on various literary questions. From his book we may, therefore, draw a picture of what a learned Greek in those days could attain, and what was the world in which he moved. His work extended to at least twenty years after our era, and from several internal data in his geography we may take him to have lived thirty years on either side of the birth of Christ. Diodorus was about a generation older, but, so far as we can infer, lived in a world very similar in social aspects, though disturbed by the last great civil wars of the Republic. To Strabo the great feature of his world is the tranquillity and order imposed by Augustus, and the safety of the ways by sea and land. But with this blessed change the spirit of speculation and adventure had been checked, and with it any exuberance of imagination that may have lingered here and there among the irreconcilables in the Hellenistic world.

---

[1] Above, p. 188.

But we must not dally with generalities; let us proceed to details.

Before I enter upon this task, I must warn the reader that a great part of Strabo's accounts[1] are confessedly borrowed from much older authors, even so far back as Polybius, and not perhaps in any case more recent than three generations before his own time. Such are Apollodorus of Artemita, on Mesopotamia; Artemidorus, above all Eratosthenes, and Agatharchides, on the Red Sea; on India no writer newer than Megasthenes. In other words, the outlying parts of the world as described by Strabo are in the Hellenistic, not in the Roman, period. I will go even further and say that almost the whole of his account of Greece proper is taken, not from autopsy, but from older authors; and I have come to the conclusion that he never made any travels through Greece, not even to Athens, the capital of Hellenistic sentiment.

---

[1] I quote uniformly from the marginal pages, given in every good edition of Strabo.

This novel conclusion is based upon the following arguments: Strabo gives in general terms[1] the extent of his travels, from the Euxine (Pontus) to the borders of Æthiopia (Syene), and from Armenia to the west coast of Etruria, opposite Corsica. He says this was a wider range than had been traversed by almost any previous writer on geography, which I quite believe, as we know the Greeks to have been very much addicted to copying from older books, and even to passing off this second-hand knowledge as personal experience. But Strabo in his statement takes care not to give any details, or name the order or extent of his travels within these extreme limits. Whether this vagueness has any dishonest intent I leave the reader to determine. For in contrast to it he does not fail to record carefully his personal observations whenever he had really visited any country. Thus his descriptions of Asia Minor—Comana, Tralles, Nysa, etc.—are interspersed with frequent statements of what he personally saw, and for this reason his *Asia Minor* is the most valuable section of all his geography. So also his *Egypt*, as he resided at Alexandria, and as he ascended to Syene in the retinue of his friend Ælius Gallus, is full of personal reminiscences. But on the other parts of the world we find him usually repeating older writers with his φασί, and when we question his text closely, we can be sure only that he sailed along the coast of Africa, on

[1] P. 117.

his way to Rome; that he knew Rome and some parts of Italy well; and that on the route from Rome to Asia he stopped at Corinth and at Gyaros. I can find no trace of his personal experience anywhere in Greece except at the places just named, and think this silence, in contrast to his constant habit of telling his reminiscences about Asia Minor and Egypt, to be conclusive that he knew Greece only from books. His account of Athens[1] in particular is that of a man encumbered with written descriptions lying before him, and with no personal observations or recollections to help him in his selection. The fact was that in these days Greece proper, with the exception of Nicopolis, Patræ, Corinth, and Athens, was really the least important part of the Hellenistic world, and in miserable decay. But even his many statements of its depopulation seem to me borrowed from older books, which date from the close of the second century B. C.

The result is this: Where Strabo states his own observations, we have pictures of the Hellenistic world about the time of Christ; where he does not, we may take for granted that the evidence is of older days, and therefore belonging rather to the times described in earlier chapters, or in my previous volume on *Greek Life and Thought.*[2]

Returning from this digression, we shall take the Roman world in Strabo's order, thus beginning with Spain, of which his account is perhaps the freshest part of the book; for though he had never seen it, he corrects his authorities by constant references to its improved condition in his own day, which he evidently learned at Rome from Romans familiar with the country. Spain can, indeed, hardly be included within the limits of Hellenism, in the sense now accepted among scholars, for whatever still survived of Greek settlements and Greek culture either dated from a time long anterior to Alexander, or was the creation of Massilia, which must be called a Hellenic, rather than a Hellenistic, town.

---

[1] P. 396.

[2] I must here call attention to the procedure of Theodor Mommsen, who generally uses the statements in the geographer not only for the Augustan, but even for the later condition of the Roman world. I cannot but think this a doubtful basis for many inferences in the famous fifth volume of his *Roman History*.

But as I noticed already the old Greek culture of the Sea of Asov, and shall return to it again, so I may say a word about Spain in relation to the settlements of Massilia down the Spanish coast from Ampurias (Emporiæ) to Carthagena, which, though not reaching outside the Straits to the strange mart of Gades, must nevertheless have had much influence even on the exclusive Phœnicians. Strabo speaks of the settlement of Emporiæ as typical of these distant colonies:

> The Greeks of Emporiæ first settled upon an outlying island, still [that is, when Artemidorus or Posidonius wrote] called the old city, but now they dwell on the mainland in a city cut in twain by a wall. There were formerly some indigenous people, who, though under a separate polity, were nevertheless desirous to dwell within the same surrounding wall as the Greeks, for safety's sake; but it was divided across the middle by the other wall already mentioned. In time they coalesced into the one city with mixed customs, Greek and barbarian—a thing which has happened in the case of other such cities.[1]

We are told elsewhere in the book that the remains of an old Phœnician settlement looked quite different, but the peculiarities are not specified.

---

[1] P. 160. We are reminded of the Manchu and Chinese cities combined in Pekin.

Of the old Phœnician towns which still flourished, by far the most remarkable was Gades, which exhibits what we should call a thoroughly Phœnician character, had we not modern analogies in non-Semitic settlements. Strabo relates with wonder how a little barren island, with no territory (till the Roman conqueror Balbus ceded to it a strip of coast), not only covered the trading lines of the Mediterranean with ships, but maintained a population inferior to no city but Rome.[1] A few of them dwelt at home, many more as commercial agents in Rome, where in a census during Strabo's sojourn 500 of them were assessed at equestrian incomes, a catalogue of wealth to be matched (outside Rome) in Patavium only. The population lived upon the sea and made great fortunes in trade. Can any one fail to see the curious analogy between all this and the condition of Hydra before the peace of 1815, when a similar barren island owned a great and rich population, and maintained it only by keeping it on sea?[2] The Gaditani had profited chiefly by the tin trade with the Cassiterides, or tin islands, which they had kept so completely to themselves that even Strabo's authorities thought them to be situated in the high seas far north of Spain.[3] But even without the Cassiterides, Gades had a splendid trade in the salt-fish of the Atlantic, which is far superior to that of the Mediterranean, and still more in commanding the mouth of the Bætis, which ran its upper course through a country rocky and barren,[4] but full of gold, silver, copper, iron, and tin ore. Such mineral wealth was not known in any other part of the ancient world; and no sooner did the river leave this poor soil, with its auriferous and argentiferous rocks, than it entered a vale of such agricultural wealth as was equally without parallel. So careful was the breeding of sheep there that a talent (£240) was paid for a first-rate ram.

---

[1] P. 168.

[2] Cf. my *Rambles and Studies*, p. 367.

[3] They were probably the small islands in Vigo Bay, not the Scilly Isles (cf. Elton, *Origins of English History*, p. 24).

[4] Strabo, p. 142.

The only plague in that blessed country—for there were hardly any noxious beasts or reptiles—was the predominance of rabbits, which did great harm to agriculture (Strabo thinks by cutting the roots of trees and crops underground), and were at that time infesting all the southwest of Europe as far as Massilia, including the islands, such as Corsica and the Balearic Isles, whose inhabitants, probably those lately imported by the Romans, besought the Senate to grant them another territory free from this plague.[1] The Spaniards had devised various remedies for this serious evil, among others the domestication of the "African weasel," "which they muzzle and send into the holes, when it either pulls out the rabbit with its nails (?) or makes it bolt for the men and dogs standing ready."[2]

The natural produce of Spain in minerals, cattle, wool, salt-fish, etc., was so enormous that Rome was supplied by this and the province of Africa in about equal shares, to

[1] P. 144.

[2] The fact that this widely extended plague has completely disappeared from Spain, France, and the islands suggests that in Australia too the day will come when natural causes will accomplish what seems too vast for human ingenuity. I am not aware that we hear of these rabbits in later classical authorities, so I suppose they must have been disappearing even in Strabo's time. *Cuniculus* in Latin means both "rabbit" and "mine." Cf. Catullus, xxxvii, 18.

judge from the relative importance of the merchant shipping of Ostia, the Spanish, and Puteoli, the African, marts. And this fact, though not within Hellenistic limits, must have had a considerable effect in depressing the condition of the Hellenic peninsula. What use was there in mining deep and laboriously at Laurium for a small and uncertain profit, when one Spanish mine (Carthagena) out of many could employ 40,000 hands, and could yield £1,000 of our money daily?

It required two hundred years of fighting and negotiating and colonising for the Romans to civilise Spain, and that not completely, for in Strabo's day (if we may regard his information here as fresh Roman and not obsolete Greek) there were still savage Cantabri, who dwelt, not in cities (πόλεις), like civilised men, but in villages (κωμηδόν), or even in forests, and submitted only slowly and unwillingly to the Roman peace. These were the people who, when staying as allies in a Roman camp, saw the Roman officers walking up and down the main avenues for exercise, and laid hold of them to bring them to their tents, thinking they must be mad;[1] for no savage understands exercise as such without some motive, such as hunting or fighting. The language of Horace[2] proves, I think, that what Strabo says is here true of his own time. Here, then, the greatest contrast between barbarism and civilisation was to be found.

The region, again, on both sides of the Bætis up to Corduba, the highest navigable point of the river, above which the rugged mining country began, was full of rich homesteads, orchards, and pastures dotted with sheep and

[1] Strabo, iii, 4. 16.

[2] *Odes*, ii, 6. 1.

cattle. Corduba was full of Roman citizens, as well as of naturalised natives, so that Strabo concludes his account of this province[1] by saying:

> With the wealth of the country the Turdetani have naturally become tame and civilised;[2] this habit prevails also among the [Spanish] Celts, either because of their proximity, or, as Polybius says, their kinship with the others; yet in a less degree, for they mostly live in villages (κωμηδόν). But the Turdetani, especially on the Bætis, are completely Romanised, and have even forgotten their old language. Most of them have become [politically] Latin, and have received Roman colonists, so that they are nearly all to be counted as Romans. The cities now established, Paxanguita [Badajos] among the Celts, Augusta Emerita [Merida] among the Turdali, Cæsar Augusta [Saragossa], and some other colonies, mark this change in the above-named people. And as many of the Spaniards as have adopted this course are called *togati*, and among these are the Celtiberians, once thought the most savage.

I have entered on these details about Spain, not for their intrinsic interest, great as it is, but in order to bring before the reader a large example of the Roman treatment of a conquered race, in order that I may compare it with the Hellenistic solution of the same problem. Nor can we avoid saying a word in this connection concerning the older Hellenic colonisation which preceded both. Though the subject has often been handled, and with great ability, I think I can put the facts from a fresh point of view, for most historians have thought of contrasting only the Hellenic, and not the Hellenistic, practice with that of the Romans. And yet the two former were widely different. Alexander inaugurated a policy new and unprecedented in Europe.

---

[1] P. 151.

[2] ἥμερον καὶ πολιτικόν.

There can be no doubt that the Phœnicians were the teachers of the old Greeks, and that, apart from the very early national migration to Asia Minor, which may perhaps be paralleled by the foundation of Carthage, most Greek colonies were trading marts, just like the Phœnician, worked upon the same principles, and producing about the same effect on the surrounding barbarians. It is commonly said that the old Greeks were more insinuating and had more talent for assimilating foreigners than the Semite traders, and this is one of those general statements for which a good deal of evidence may be adduced. But, unfortunately, the Phœnician side is not represented in the remains of our classical literature, and if we take the case best known to us, that of Sicily, which was occupied by both races, we shall hesitate to say that the inhabiting Greeks, with all their assimilating genius, laid a greater hold upon the island than the mere trading Carthaginians. So, also, when Hamilcar saw that to contend with success against the Romans he must procure a more numerous and a better infantry than that of his Libyans and Hellenistic mercenaries, the facility with which his Carthaginians made an empire in Spain shows an ability for conciliating barbarians as remarkable as any similar case in the history of the Greeks.

There were, indeed, many deep contrasts between these colonising races, but they are not so obvious as the resemblances. Both nations brought their gods with them, and paid little honour to the local deities; neither seems to have been proficient in learning the native language of its new abodes. Both almost invariably settled on a seaboard, and trusted to the "wet ways" to keep up their communications with one another and with the mother-country. If the Greeks succeeded ultimately in ousting their rivals from most of the Mediterranean trade, it was not, I think, on account of their superior genius, but on account of their superior numbers; they drew from a home population—counting all the cities and coasts and islands round the Levant—many hundred times greater than the population of Phœnicia.

As regards seamanship, it is probable that the Phœnicians were always superior; Xenophon certainly alludes to a big Phœnician ship in the harbour of Corinth as a special sight to see, on account of its decided superiority in order, neatness, and marine resources.[1] But in the following feature both kinds of colonies were alike, that though possessing, by means of ships, an easy communication with their mother-lands, they were expected to take care of themselves, and, except in the rarest cases, received from the old home no material support in their difficulties. In fact, their relations with that home were more often strained by commercial jealousies than strengthened by mutual sympathy in misfortunes.

As regards their nearer relations with the surrounding natives, it is, I think, generally assumed that the Phœnicians did not fuse by marriage with their neighbours, and that the Greeks did. The traces of old Phœnician settlements at Athens, Thebes, and Corinth, which, as the local religions of these cities show, did not always terminate with the expulsion of the Semites as enemies, appear to contradict this assumption, at least as regards very old times. It is not unlikely that the known exclusiveness of the Jews in the *diaspora*[1] has inclined historians to ascribe a similar spirit to the Phœnicians, though these latter had no capital like Jerusalem, with its unique worship of Jehovah, for their ideal rallying-point. If Strabo had told us what the difference was in the aspect of Phœnician and Greek coast settlements,[2] we might know more of their respective treatment of the natives. The case of Emporiæ, which he there describes, shows how slow and tentative was the natives' amalgamation with the Greeks; and the general inability of the Italiot cities, rich and old as they were, to effect any peaceable settlement with the Apulians and Samnites, speaks little for Greek colonising ability.

---

[1] Cf. my *Social Life in Greece*, p. 419.

With Alexander the Great begins a very different system, carried out on Asiatic principles, which is very unfortunately called by the same name. Macedonia was in its essential features an inland, and not a naval, power, and the conqueror sought to annex provinces, not to found mere trading marts. He desired to embrace in one empire widely scattered and various domains, and he sought to establish his power by founding many local centres of Græco-Macedonian influence along the old highroads, and on the exposed frontiers of his conquests. We must remember that he had his great thoroughfares prepared for him by the Persian monarchs. Highroads and posts were an old institution through Asia, so far as he penetrated. So were military colonies in remote provinces to hold the natives in check.[3] His primary object

[1] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 469.

[2] Cf. above, p. 228, and Strabo, iii, 4. 2.

[3] Cf. Strabo (xiii, 4. 13), who thus explains the geographical names "Hyrcanian Plain" and "Cyrus' Plain," close to Mount Tmolus in Asia Minor.

was to secure these roads both for commerce and for administration, to protect exposed frontiers, and to impose upon his new subjects visible signs of the power and unity of the Macedonian Empire. He also desired to endow his veterans with lands, and create garrisons with a vital interest in defending their fortresses.

His foundation of Alexandria is, to my mind, quite a different thing. It was from the first intended as a capital or centre for his empire, and though it is possible that Babylon would have supplanted it, when he found himself master of all the far East, yet from first to last Alexandria was far more than a colony in any sense of the word. But the many towns of the same name founded in upper Asia, of which Candahar,[1] etc., still remain, were distinctly military colonies of the Asiatic type, in which his veterans and other Macedonian or Greek immigrants received grants of land or full civic rights, while the surrounding population remained in an inferior condition. But if these settlements were threatened from without, they had, theoretically at least, the whole power of the Empire at their back, and were not thrown loose from, far less permitted to act in opposition to, the mother-country, in any such sense as the old Greek or Phœnician colonies so often were.

If the Romans wanted a model for their "occupying" colonies, it was surely there that they found it. They did not, indeed, find roads ready as Alexander did; they had to make them for themselves; but their insistence upon this very task looks very like a servile copying of his policy. Thus they fought for eighty years to secure a highroad along the Riviera to the mouth of the Rhone, whereas they had all the time ample naval power to keep up their communications by sea. They settled their outposts in some fruitful valley, like that of Corduba or Lugdunum, and so made centres for Roman settlers to promote both agriculture and commerce. The gradations by which the Romans proposed to bring the natives into the imperial system were more definite than those usual in the Hellenistic kingdoms; but the fact that we still dispute whether the Jews of Antioch and Alexandria had equal civic rights with the Greeks shows that such admissions were perfectly recognised at that time. There can be no doubt that by intermarriages and by performing public benefits the native men of importance obtained promotion to full Hellenistic rights.

---

[1] From Iskandar, the eastern form of Alexander, which Semitic people understood as if *al* was an article; hence the apparently divergent form. Mr. Sayce tells me the old Assyrian colonies were the model copied by all the later conquerors of Asia.

But the complication which affected all the colonies of Alexander in Asia, so far as it was civilised, was the occurrence of free Greek cities in Asia Minor, whose privileges he respected, and whose communal independence he secured to them as soon as he had broken their very light Persian yoke. This condition of being a free city, managing its own affairs, and not tolerating a Macedonian governor, was the favoured stage to which all the new Græco-Macedonian colonies constantly aspired. As soon as the central power grew weak, this right was demanded with no uncertain sound, and this was the so-called "liberty of the Greeks" which makes such a figure in the politics of the great wars after Alexander.[1] The power of Macedon was too well consolidated to tolerate such cities within its proper limits; the Ptolemies, who had Egypt thoroughly organised as a royal property, founded only Ptolemais in the Thebaid and Arsinoe in the Fayyum, which had special privileges, but in no real sense autonomy.[1] It was in Syria and Palestine that the numerous Hellenistic foundations, originally controlled by Seleucid governors, asserted and received this modified independence, which they marked by distinct coinage and by commencing the era of their history from the date of their charters. Similar special privileges were continued to towns in inner Asia by the Arsacids, who, for example, gave Seleucia on the Tigris various immunities in return for its allegiance. These so-called free Greek cities were a great source of weakness to the Seleucid Empire, as may be amply verified by reading the *Histories* of Polybius or of Josephus.

---

[1] Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 79.

It is remarkable that in this detail also Roman provincial administration copied its Hellenistic forerunners. There were free cities in nominal alliance with Rome wherever there were important outlying Hellenic foundations, such as Massilia, several towns in Sicily, many in Asia Minor, etc. But I need hardly add that these cities never had the same power for mischief that we find them exercising in the Seleucid Empire. Massilia, indeed, had for a moment distinct importance in the opposition to Cæsar—Alexandria was then still outside the Roman dominions—but otherwise they were quite insignificant as opponents of the Empire. Nor were they the really important civilisers under Rome. The *urbes togatæ*, if I may so call them—Carthagena, Narbo, Cæsar-Augusta, and the rest—were now the real leaven which brought new, and as yet uncivilised, races, under the fascination of letters and of art. But apart from this difference, not of principle, but of circumstances, all the main features of Roman colonisation had been long recognised in the Hellenistic world.

---

[1] Perhaps there were more (e. g. Naucratis), but their number was certainly small. We know the title *Hellenomemphites*; on Thebes cf. above, p. 202. We have from Pa-khem in the Thebaid (the Greek Panopolis) a piece of leather with this inscription: *ἱερὸς εἰσελευστικὸς οἰκουμενικὸς ὀλυμπικὸς ἀγὼν Πέρσεως οὐρανίου τῶν μεγάλων Πανείων*, showing a Greek festival there in Roman days, and this, too, not a merely local festival. Maspero thinks (*Revue des études grecques*, Vol. II, p. 164) that this Perseus was probably the Egyptian deity worshipped in the place as *Pahrison*.

There was even one curious application of it frequent under the Seleucids and Ptolemies, of which the Romans had no need; I mean the founding of a city as an acknowledged royal foundation in territory beyond the sovran's control and the bounds of his dominion. That the Ptolemies should do this in the Troglodyte country means only that they established trading marts among the outlying savages; but what shall we say to such towns as Lysimachia and Arsinoe, founded by Kings Lysimachus and Ptolemy II, respectively, in Ætolia; the refounding of Patara in Lycia as Arsinoe by the latter; and of Attalia in Pamphylia by Attalus Philadelphus? That these settlements were intended to promote the influence of their founders is certain, but in what manner? I will here advance a conjecture at least as to the Ætolian and Lycian foundations. Both these territories were at the time under the political condition of free leagues, in which each city had a vote. Probably it was not considered constitutional among the free cities, or dignified for a

Ptolemy or a Lysimachus, that a great king should be a formal member of such a league as the Ætolian, and yet in matters of restitution, especially of piratical spoils, such membership was very valuable.[1] Hence, by the means of a special foundation these kings may have acquired a vote and voice in the league, and secured themselves against its hostility, and possibly against its piracy. The other instance is equally in the country of a league—the Lycian—which may have extended into Pamphylia. By this device, then, Hellenistic kings might acquire diplomatic rights as well as personal popularity beyond the bounds of their dominions. Whether there were such cases elsewhere I do not know.

The more we recede from the West, the more we come within the reach of mixed influences, old Hellenic and recent Roman, upon the inferior races. I say inferior, in the sense of development, for the inhabitants of northern Europe have since shown that they waxed slower indeed, but not to a less perfection. The great frames of the British youths whom Strabo saw in Rome were ungainly in his eyes; so was their mental condition; but, in the words of Tacitus, *sera atque ideo inexhausta juventas.* The account given of Massilia, no longer indeed a colony, but really a metropolis with her own settlements along the Ligurian and Spanish coasts, is among the most interesting passages in Strabo. When her naval power and real independence were gone, she became by her ancient and pure Hellenic culture a favoured seat of higher Roman education.[2]

---

[1] Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 366.

[2] Since, he says, the surrounding barbarians have been tamed, and have turned to city life and husbandry owing to the Roman

I think it very remarkable that this Hellenic influence was comparatively powerless till protected by Roman energy and arms. It was the foundation of Aquæ Sextiæ as a military post among the tribes threatening that coast which first freed Massilia from constant apprehensions of Gallic tumults. So also it was the eighty years' determined conflict which the Romans waged with the Ligurians, to assert and maintain the security of the Riviera highway, which relieved Massilia from the cost of protecting all her traders against the pirates of that dangerous route.[1]

But let it be remembered that this was one of the most perfect specimens of Hellenic, as distinguished from Hellenistic, colonisation. If the truth be told, the effects it produced in six centuries, despite its excellent internal government, its thrift, its energy, were singularly small. The Massiliots could tell Scipio Æmilianus nothing about Britain, nor could they tell Strabo.[2] Even their traders therefore stuck to the Mediterranean, and seldom ventured round Spain or across the plains of Gaul to the Atlantic.

---

sway, the Massiliots no longer require to attend to their military and naval power. This their present condition proves: πάντες γὰρ οἱ χαρίεντες πρὸς τὸ λέγειν τρέπονται καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν, ὥσθ' ἡ πόλις μικρὸν μὲν πρότερον τοῖς βαρβάροις ἀνεῖτο παιδευτήριον, καὶ φιλέλληνας κατεσκεύαζε τοὺς Γαλάτας, ὥστε καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια Ἑλληνιστὶ γράφειν· ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι καὶ τοὺς γνωριμωτάτους Ῥωμαίων πέπεικεν, ἀντὶ τῆς εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀποδημίας ἰέναι ἐκεῖσε, φιλομαθεῖς ὄντας. In imitation of this, the Gauls have taken to these studies, not only individually, but as public affairs, for they hire "Sophists," not only privately, but even as public officers, in the same way that cities hire doctors.

It is a great pity that these interesting texts are so seldom read in colleges.

[1] Massilia had attempted the same thing, not in Roman fashion, by a good road, but by planting various stations in sheltered nooks along the coast, which could afford a frequent refuge for coasting vessels, and keep off pirates.

[2] P. 190.

What was true of Massilia must have been true in even a higher degree of the inferior trading settlements of the Hellenes. It was not till the Romans became the pupils of the Massiliots that Hellenic fashions really "took" among the inhabitants of Gaul; but it was not merely that these latter copied the fashion of their new masters; it was rather that their old occupations were gone, and were thus replaced.

I will cite a modern, though remote, parallel. No doubt the culture of the Persians has been of late so superior to that of the Turkomans of the steppes that these barbarians adopted from them many improvements; but it is only since the strong domination of the Russians has compelled them to lay aside their ancestral habit of raiding and man-stealing that they are adopting the agricultural habits of their weaker southern neighbours. Whatever other ambitions Russia may foster within her secret counsels, this has been her great and very important mission in upper Asia.

But I must leave these western lands, which are not within the scope of this enquiry, though the separating lines which distinguish Hellenedom from Hellenism are now again becoming effaced, so that the consideration of any Greek communities under the Empire can hardly be foreign to our studies.

CHAPTER XI

THE REMAINING HELLENISM OF ITALY (CHIEFLY MAGNA GRÆCIA)

Let us now pass to Italy and Sicily, on which our geographer deserves a close examination. And here, if anywhere, we should have expected personal notes of value, seeing that he certainly lived long at Rome, and must have been in the middle of good society in that great capital. Yet, apart from the general description of the splendours of the city, and its contrast to Greek towns both in the inferiority of the site, and the superiority in the building of roadways, drains, and in its splendid water supply, he really tells us nothing beyond these two facts—that he saw a Sicilian bandit torn to pieces by beasts at a gladiatorial show, the criminal being dropped into a cage full of them, and that he heard the grammarian Tyrannio. Strabo belonged to that important class of literary men who now made Rome their permanent home or their frequent residence, and to whom is mainly due the earnest attempt to revive old style and strict taste in Greek letters. I am afraid we cannot include in this worthy class the many epigrammatists whom we shall consider presently. But as regards prose we have not only such solid works as those of Strabo and Nicolaus in actual history and geography; we have also a considerable literature in grammar and rhetoric, and more especially essays on æsthetic taste, such as those of the so-called

Longinus, and also of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who certainly did more than any other man to disseminate sound views upon the real excellences of the old Greek masters.

To him the advent of Cæsar is an age of gold, not only for the political world, but for the literature of Greece. During his twenty-two years' residence he had lived to see the change coming, and heralds it in a remarkable passage,[1] where he says Rome is the active cause, in that her greatness forces every city to look to her; and her rulers, being educated and just men, have promoted the sound elements in her population and compelled folly and ignorance to hold their peace. Hence have already arisen many refined works on history and philosophy, and no doubt many more are yet to come.

Apart from Rome there were three different *loci* of old Greek influence still recognised in Italy—the tract round Ravenna, the southern Campanian coast, and the remains of the old Magna Græcia from Tarentum to Croton. Ravenna, which Strabo describes (from his authorities) much as we should describe Venice now—a city with more canals than streets—was once inferior to the neighbouring Spina, which enjoyed, as did the Etrurian Cære, the dignity of possessing a special treasure-house at Delphi. But all the country round had now become pasture land, and Cisalpine Gaul, as it was called—that is to say, Italy north of the Apennines and reaching down on the east coast to Ravenna—was now supplying Rome with beef and pork. The Greek settlements made from Sicily in the days of the tyrant Dionysius were least of all affected by the Hellenistic wave. Their trade was probably ruined by the Illyrian pirates of the opposite coast long before the Romans subdued that country, so that their greatness and influence were but a waning tradition saved from oblivion by Strabo.

---

[1] *De oratoribus antiquis*, 2.

As his information about Spina was from books, so he draws his account of Magna Græcia, of Sicily, and of the Liparæan Islands from Antiochus, from Polybius—in fact, from very old literary sources; nor can I find that he anywhere does more than occasionally verify their statements by the accounts of eyewitnesses. We may likewise feel sure that when he describes the decay and desolation of Lucania and Calabria, which had gone back into wild pasture land, with occasional villages, he represents what was told him by some of his Roman friends who had traversed the country. The Roman rule over these once rich and thriving coasts seems to have been little better than King Bomba's management.[1] Still we should have been thankful for some personal notes, instead of being put off with long antiquarian disquisitions about the mythical founders of the Hellenic colonies in the West. Tarentum was still alive, and Brundusium, on account of its importance as a starting-point for the East, which has recently again revived; and Tarentum—as we may infer from its later history, its colossi,[2] its condottieri—did partake of Hellenistic ideas, and was, therefore, with

---

[1] Thus Strabo, speaking of the whole country once called Magna Græcia, says (p. 252): *νυνὶ δὲ πλὴν Τάραντος καὶ Ῥηγίου καὶ Νεαπόλεως ἐκβεβαρβαρῶσθαι συμβέβηκεν ἅπαντα, καὶ τὰ μὲν Λευκάνους καὶ Βρεττίους κατέχειν, τὰ δὲ Καμπάνους, καὶ τούτους λόγῳ, τὸ δ'ἀληθὲς Ῥωμαίους· καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ Ῥωμαῖοι γεγόνασιν.* About 1840 the king of Naples sent a force of two thousand soldiers on a military promenade into Calabria. They were lost there for a fortnight, and no one at Naples knew what had become of them.

[2] Cf. Strabo, vi, 3. 2, on a colossus transferred to Rome.

Syracuse, perhaps the main representative of this modern kind of Greek life in the "Two Sicilies." But all the coast and its inner country were gone in importance, decayed in population, the cities reduced to villages, the villages to single farmsteads; nor was there any part of the Roman Empire which showed more melancholy lapse from its ancient splendour.

The one spot in Italy which still represented Greek manners and Greek feeling was the northern arm of the Bay of Naples. There had been a very ancient Greek city—Cumæ—settled near it in almost pre-historic times.[1] This city was to the north of the promontory which runs out towards Procida, and lay in an exceedingly volcanic country—evidently the centre of disturbance previous to the historic outbreak of Vesuvius. These Greeks had afterwards founded both Dicæarchia and Neapolis in the shelter of the bay. Of these, Naples had in earlier times been obliged to admit Samnites (or Campanians, as Strabo calls them) to its privileges, and was so far not a purely Greek town, but had in consequence obtained immunity from the attacks which ruined Elea, Posidonia, and the other coast cities. But in the days which are now under our consideration a curious change had taken place. Naples had remained stationary; it had, in fact, become quiet and old-fashioned, and was thought essentially Greek. Strabo agrees precisely with Cicero[2] when he says that elderly or delicate Romans liked living there in retirement, and adopting Greek dress and manners.[1] I have already quoted, in connection with the orator, the geographer's account of the Hellenic dress and customs maintained there, as well as of the feasts, both old and new, which attracted companies of Dionysiac players from Greece and Asia Minor. Strabo goes on to describe the tunnel on the road leading to Puteoli. Naples had also hot springs and arrangements for baths.

---

[1] Probably in the eighth century B. C.; not, of course, at the ridiculous date 1050 B. C., probably set down by Ephorus (of Kyme) to glorify his native city and her colonies. Nothing has misled simple modern scholars, both German and English, more than this very common kind of mendacity, which Greek historians considered a sort of duty, or at least a very laudable patriotism.

[2] Above, p. 146; cf. also *pro Balbo*, 55; Horace's *Otiosa Neapolis*, Epod., 4. 43.

The two towns lying seaward, Puteoli and Baiæ, though still within the sheltering arm of the headland, had absorbed the business and the fashion of that part of the world. The whole coast of Campania was, indeed, covered with sumptuous Roman villas—palaces (*βασίλεια*) Strabo repeatedly calls them—as well as with pleasure grounds; but as a fashionable public watering-place Baiæ exceeded all the rest. This resort was, however, more distinctly Roman; the great Hellenistic port for all the eastern trade of Rome was the neighbouring Dicæarchia, renamed Puteoli (Pozzuoli). This place had long since been established as the open port for Alexandrian ships, at a time when the Romans would have been very jealous of allowing foreigners to enter the Tiber at Ostia; and so it always remained the mart of Rome with the East. If you did not land at Brundusium and come through Tarentum and Apulia, you came to Puteoli. For heavy merchandise the long and mountainous land journey was expensive and unsuitable; we may even assume that at Puteoli the more cumbrous articles were reshipped into coasting vessels and brought to the Tiber. But from

---

[1] P. 246.

Puteoli there were at least no mountains to be crossed on the way to Rome. As the railway now winds through the spurs of the Abruzzi which approach the coast about Ceprano and Gaeta, so the old highroad could avoid all difficult passes; and these were days when any land journey might be safer than the perils of the sea from pirates.

Such were the reasons which made Puteoli the channel of that Hellenistic influence which is so manifest in the remains of Herculaneum and Pompeii. We have, in these curious and affecting relics of the great catastrophe of 79 A. D., the clearest possible evidence of that fusion of Hellenistic taste with Roman life which was the type of the civilisation of Strabo's age. In this part, therefore, of his survey we can supplement the geographer's account by the numerous Greek inscriptions now collected in the *Corpus*, as well as by the splendid collection of art and household objects in the Museum of Naples, not to speak of the unique impression produced by walking about the deserted streets of the once gay and charming Pompeii.

As regards Naples, the evidence of the inscriptions shows clearly that it was, as Strabo and Cicero tell us, far the most distinctly Greek town remaining on the Campanian coast. For Cumæ, a purely Greek foundation, had so decayed that the body of its population had migrated to Neapolis.[1] The remainder even begged the Roman Senate (180 B. C.) to allow them *publice Latine loqui*, and so to assimilate themselves to the Roman municipia.[2] The Neapolitans, on the other hand, profited

[1] Which, in this case, Mommsen rightly conjectures (*CIL.*, X, 170), implies no Palæopolis except Cumæ, there being no evidence either from inscriptions or coins of any other forerunner to Neapolis.

[2] Livy, xl, 42: "Cumanis petentibus permissum, ut publice Latine loquerentur et præconibus Latine vendendi jus esset."

so much from their reputation among Roman dilettanti as a Greek centre, especially from their right of harbouring Roman exiles of distinction,[1] that they hesitated to accept higher political privileges from Rome, and at last did so only under the condition that they were *not* to use Latin in their public acts.[2] Thus we have Roman names with Greek official titles commemorated in Greek inscriptions. We know that the Dionysiac artists made it their favourite resort; we find a regular Greek four-years' feast with artistic and athletic contests established there under the title Ἰταλικὰ Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ Ἰσολύμπια,[3] which served as an epoch from the year 2 A. D.; and numerous bilingual inscriptions—nay, even some in a jumble of Greek and Latin[4]—attest the general knowledge and use of Greek at Naples down to the fourth century A. D.

---

[1] Polybius, vi, 14. 8.

[2] Cf. Mommsen's account of this, *CIL.*, X, 172.

[3] *IGSI.*, 748 = *CIG.*, 5805. At these games Alexandrians frequently appear. In *IGSI.*, 747 = *CIG.*, 5804, *ἡ φιλοσέβαστος καὶ φιλορώμαιος Ἀλεξανδρέων περιπολιστικὴ εὐσεβὴς σύνοδος* honour an Alexandrian Archibius for his victories.

[4] Here is one from Sorrento (*IGSI.*, 698 = *CIG.*, 5870) in Greek characters, as follows: Δ. Ε. Μ. | ΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΥΣ | ΙΝΠΕΤΡΑΤΟΥΣ | Β. Κ. Μ. ΒΕΙΞ. ΑΝΟΣ | Ν. ΜΝΞΕΣ. ϟ. ΔΕΙ. Ν | ΚΟΖΟΥΣ ΙΜΒΕΙΑ. ΕΙ | ΡΗΝΑ ΜΑΡΙΤΟ ΒΕΝΕ | ΜΕΡΕΝΤΙ. ΦΝ | ΚΕΤ. Transcribed into Roman letters this becomes: De[is] m(anibus, Aurelius inpetratus, b(eteranus) c(lassis) M(isenensis) veix(it) an(n)o(s) L, me(n)ses vii, dei(es) viii. co( )iu(n)x Imbeia Eirena marito bene merenti fecit.

As a specimen of a bilingual inscription I give *IGSI.*, 882 = *CIG.*, 5876:

ΔΕCΠΟΙΝΗΝΕΜΕCΕΙ | ΚΑΙCΥΝΝΑΟΙCΙΘΕΟΙCΙ
[ΑΡ]ΡΙΑΝΟCΒΩΜΟΝ | ΤΟΝΔΕΚΑΘΕΙΔΡΥCΑΤΟ

IVSTITIAE. NEMESI | FATIS. QVAM VOVERAT. ARAM
NVMINA. SANCTA. COLENS | CAMMARIVS. POSVIT

This is a very free translation; cf. further *IGSI.*, 803 and 809 = *CIG.*, 5820 and 5821.

There are many obvious reasons why the greater and more stirring port of Puteoli should not show in its inscriptions so thoroughly a Greek flavour. The trade relations with Rome, and perhaps the rivalries of many nationalities represented by guilds or trading agents, would make a closer approach to Roman municipal arrangements more convenient. It was the business place, not the fashionable resort, like Baiæ, or the refined literary retreat, like Naples. And so the inscriptions show us a far more systematic use of Latin, though the absorption of all that has been found in these regions into the Museum of Naples makes it hard to pass a positive judgment in such matters. Until the *locus* of each inscription is carefully recorded, there will always remain great difficulty in deciding such questions. Perhaps the most interesting of all those collected in Boeckh's *Corpus* is that recording the complaint of the Tyrian Company at Puteoli to their mother-city that the whole expense of keeping up the Tyrian cults at Puteoli devolved upon them, while the Tyrians settled at Rome, who made far greater profits on the goods imported through Puteoli, did not contribute to this burden. The reply from Tyre follows, ordaining that the Tyrians at Rome should bear their share in this duty.[1] The fact that these old and famous Semite traders recorded their corporate, but purely national, affairs in Greek gives us evidence, perhaps more striking than any usually cited, to prove the adoption of the Hellenistic idiom as the language of the civilised world.

[1] *IGSI.*, 830 = *CIG.*, 5853, the most interesting of all the Puteolan inscriptions; but as it dates from the reign of the emperor Marc. Aurelius (174 A. D.), I forbear to quote it.

When we come to Pompeii, the case is again different. In the first place, Pompeii was not a Greek but an Oscan foundation, though even here we find the principal temple to be a very old construction, in the Doric style of its great extant neighbour at Pæstum, and possibly dating from the sixth century B. C.[1] Then came a period of Sabellian influence, concluded by Sulla's sending a colony of veterans to settle there, to whom the older inhabitants were obliged to cede one-third of their lands. Here, then, we have a town neither in origin nor in circumstances very liable to Hellenistic influences, if we except the fact that it was the near neighbour of Hellenic and Hellenistic populations.

Accordingly, we find from the numerous inscriptions yielded by its walls and monuments that Greek was not the usual, or even a frequent, language of its people, though this language was taught in its schools; for the children have left us numerous specimens of the Greek alphabet scratched upon the walls on their way through the streets. And yet when we turn from the inscriptions to the actual houses and their contents, there is hardly any corner of the life and ways of the inhabitants which does not show clear traces of Hellenistic influence—Hellenistic, I say, and not Hellenic; for, with the exception of a very few bronzes which may possibly go back to originals as early as Praxiteles—I mean the famous dancing Faun and the Narcissus—all the statues, paintings, mosaics, vases, bronze and silver ornaments, as well as the designs of the houses and public buildings, are distinctly modelled on Alexandrian ideas.[1]

---

[1] It is now so completely ruined that I cannot think this inference from its remnants quite conclusive, and suspect it may possibly have been a later copy of these great models. But the art critics, such as Overbeck, who have examined it, seem to feel no doubts on the point.

A great part of the unearthed town can be referred to the work of a very few years, 63–79 A. D.; for in the former of these Vesuvius gave the first premonitory sign of the horrors that were to come by an earthquake which shook down most of the town. So grave was the case that the Roman government even debated whether the site should not at once be abandoned, and many citizens are said to have left the place. Nevertheless, the rebuilding was actively resumed, just as in our day the people of Casamicciola have rebuilt their town over another quasi-extinct volcano at Ischia, which may presently cause a similar tragedy. But it would be a great mistake to compare a second-rate town in the first century with a second-rate town in modern Italy. Though Pompeii was no doubt vastly inferior to Naples and Puteoli, the elegance and wealth of some of the houses show that people of large means and high culture resided there. The interior of several of these dwellings would satisfy the most fastidious modern magnate in everything but the size of the rooms. All this elegance was in design, and probably in execution, Greek work. The researches of Helbig have established what he calls an Osco-Roman character in some of the rudest and worst of the paintings, but all the subjects of the better class are from Greek mythology, unless it be that Alexandrian habits have suggested a few Egyptian subjects,[2] which seem to hold the place in this epoch that Japanese designs have assumed in western decoration.

---

[1] Cf. Th. Schreiber in *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. X, p. 399.

[2] The temple of Isis, of which considerable portions still remain, and which was decorated throughout with Egyptian figures or in

On the other hand, the decoration of their walls was not genuine Greek work, but surface imitation. The whole new town was a town of stucco. Overbeck has well explained[1] that, though the use of stucco to cover rough stone surfaces for the purpose of painting them is quite legitimate, and commonly found in the best Greek architecture, the enlargement of this use into the imitation of stone forms, such as architraves, mouldings, etc., thus adding sham members to the real structure, is a proof of decaying taste. This no doubt is true, though both the Saracens in their mosques and the Renaissance decorators in their ceilings have produced wonderful effects with stucco additions to the real structure. But what shall we say to the occurrence in Pompeii of a colonnade turned from the Doric into the Corinthian order by the addition of stucco capitals laid around the original echinus? In the same style is the constant effort to imitate variegated marbles by painting, and other devices intended to suggest materials more precious than those actually employed.[2]

The recent researches of the French school at Delos have led to the discovery of private houses there also, one of them not ruined beyond recognition. A comparison

---

Egyptian style, must have given a model for this sort of ornament. Even a hieroglyphic tablet was set up in it, which had no reference to the temple. Cf. the full description of this building in Overbeck's *Pompeii*, pp. 102 *sq.* We know from *CIG.*, 5793, that the statues even of Greek gods, such as Apollo, were dedicated in temples of Isis. He appears in a triad with Horus and Harpocrates.

[1] *Pompeii*, pp. 439, 467, 469.

[2] *Pompeii*, p. 464. This, too, was a very old Egyptian device, as Mr. Sayce informs me.

with the house-building of Pompeii is obviously suggested, as the houses at Delos were evidently ruined in the first century (either by Mithradates or the pirates), and because Delos then contained, like Pompeii, a Græco-Roman population. In an article[1] by M. Paris there is a plan of such a house, with many interesting details. The outcome is this, that while there was much less decoration by painting, and while the Delian householder was content with plain panels upon his walls with no ornament, the materials of his pillars and the general construction were far superior to the very shoddy building of Pompeii.

We have before us, therefore, in Pompeii a civilisation recognising a certain kind of culture, both external and internal, so tyrannically the fashion, that those who cannot afford to live up to it in reality will content themselves with cheap imitations rather than adopt any other simpler and truer life. With these defects and drawbacks we have, nevertheless, before us in this buried town the picture of a graceful and cheery life, with much that was really beautiful and refined, and with less of grossness or immorality than would be hereafter found in most of our modern towns, were they now suddenly sealed up for the inspection of future generations.

Herculaneum was covered with a deeper and more solid pall, and has a town, Torre del Greco, now planted over it, and therefore its excavation has been more troublesome and far less complete.[2] But the library found in one of the mansions, doubtless that of a Roman noble, is curiously significant in its defects. In the first place, among the 250 rolls unravelled and deciphered there is an exceedingly small proportion of Latin. In the next place, all the Greek rolls as yet published are Epicurean tracts, and of these almost all are either documents of the master, or tracts by Philodemus, a very tenth-rate pupil whom we have already met in the course of this book. So far, not a single masterpiece of Greek literature, not a single work on history, nothing of general interest, has been discovered. I cannot but think that among the many charred rolls still lying neglected in the Naples Museum some few may contain a text of higher interest; those, however, who have spent most time upon them seem not to have much hope. If, then, the only library we have yet found in this corner of Roman Hellenism, whether by accident or not, indicates but a poor attempt at culture, and shows that the owner either read nothing, or was limited to one very narrow subject in his choice, it is perhaps more likely that his Greek confidant, whether it was Philodemus or not, collected his books for him, and that the studies of the host were simply dictated to him by his household professor.

---

[1] *BCH.*, Vol. VIII, p. 473.

[2] Quite recently (1905) Professor Waldstein, of Cambridge, has been devoting himself to the organising of an international excavation of this most promising site.

This verification in sundry details of the general indications in Strabo, vague and scanty as they are, makes us long for some similar help in the case of other Hellenistic districts of Italy. But we have every reason to believe his statement that there was, except in Campania, general decay and depopulation. He does not notice the fact that even Sicily was ceasing to be the corn granary of Rome, owing to the superior productiveness and precociousness of the African soil and climate. But he does say that this country also was in his day abandoned to shepherds, neatherds, and horse-breeders,[1] which had not been its condition when Cicero went there to gather evidence against Verres, and it was a Sicilian bandit infesting these wilds whom Strabo publicly executed at Rome. He also gives an interesting description of Mount Ætna derived, as he tells us, from the accounts of recent tourists there,[2] and implies that the town of Ætna lived on the new trade of providing for these tourists, who were now very numerous. Unfortunately, he endeavours to supply his want of further information, not by an even superficial personal visit, but by antiquarian lore taken from Dionysius of Syracuse, Polybius, and other old books. The same is the case with the African coast—Carthage and Cyrene, which latter he merely saw from the sea[3] as he was sailing to and from Alexandria. He can give us no clear account of the restored Carthage, or of Cirta, both of which must have had many Hellenistic elements, for he tells us that King Micipsa, the father of Jugurtha, known to us through Sallust, settled many Greeks in the latter, and made it a great capital. Here, then, was an outlying centre of Greek culture. In the days now before us King Juba had married the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, and, having lived a life of literary labour, which indicates high civilisation, had left his kingdom of Mauretania to his son Ptolemy, a late survival of this royal name and line. This Juba probably reigned at Cirta, and had a seaport which he enlarged and called Cæsarea. Utica had been from the Second Punic War the centre of Roman influence.

---

[1] *τὴν οὖν ἐρημίαν κατανοήσαντες οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, κατακτησάμενοι τά τε ὄρη καὶ τῶν πεδίων τὰ πλεῖστα ἱπποφορβοῖς καὶ βουκόλοις καὶ ποιμέσι παρέδοσαν* (p. 273).

[2] P. 274: *οἱ δ' οὖν νεωστὶ ἀναβάντες διηγοῦντο ἡμῖν.*

[3] xvii, 3. 20.

The extant inscriptions from the five towns of the Cyrenaica show us that there too survived a great deal of Greek life which would have been worth a visit, had Strabo taken the trouble. A very interesting text now preserved in Provence, but brought from Berenice in that district, shows us an arrangement clearly copied from Alexandria and Antioch, by which the Jews there formed a separate polity under their own officers, distinct from the ordinary citizens. This community records the virtues and gentle manners of a Roman prætor, Titius, significantly too in the Greek language, and with the intention of setting up the text in a conspicuous place in the amphitheatre.[1]

Unfortunately, inscriptions seldom give the kind of information of which we are in search. We get lists of victors at games, or public officers; catalogues of property or of expenses; on the tombs many records of sincere grief, no doubt also of affected lamentation—the latter in metrical epigrams of more or less grace or correctness. But these, even when heartfelt and simple, only reiterate the universal sorrows of every age and clime—the sense of bereavement, the feeling of gratitude for the kindnesses of the departed, the feeling of rebellion against death, which takes not only the old and ripe, but the young and the strong, before they have tasted the sweets of life and love. They have not even rewarded by their success the anxious cares and hopes of their parents, who protest against this injustice with unavailing complaints. This frame of mind is perhaps the chief peculiarity which these sepulchral inscriptions disclose, as compared with later texts commemorating Christian grief.

---

[1] *CIG.*, 5361: *ἐπεὶ Μάρκος Τίττιος* (his public functions follow) *οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις ἀβαρῆ ἑαυτὸν παρέσχηται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντυγχάνουσι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἡμῶν Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εὔχρηστον προστασίαν ποιούμενος οὐ διαλείπει τῆς ἰδίας καλοκἀγαθίας ἄξια πράσσων ὧν χάριν ἔδοξε τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῷ πολιτεύματι τῶν ἐν Βερενίκῃ Ἰουδαίων ἐπαινέσαι τε αὐτὸν καὶ στεφανοῦν*, etc. It was set up in the amphitheatre, and its date is probably 13 B. C. This document is very important in giving us evidence that the Jews did not count among the ordinary Greek citizens in Hellenistic towns.

There is perhaps another peculiarity in the complaint of civic authorities how hard it is to bring any consolation to bear on the afflicted, whose loss the city deplores in pompous praises, or rather phrases, by way of balm to heal the gaping wounds in the hearts of the survivors.[1] These things are worth a passing mention, but give us little towards a distinctive picture of the peculiar race and age we are sketching. There remains yet another feature, which strikes me as far more characteristic. Any one who will take the trouble to wade through the Greek inscriptions in any collection, or to watch the new additions to the great *Corpus*, recorded in the current journals of epigraphy, cannot but be struck with the praise on almost every page of *good manners* as the quality in men and women which earns grateful recognition during their life and affectionate remembrance from posterity. The text just cited is one of a thousand which state that "because such an one has not only performed his duties, public or private, but also has been courteous to those whom he met in daily intercourse,"[2] therefore he is honoured with a statue, an inscription, civic immunities, citizenship, as the case may be. Nor are these laudations confined to men of high official station, whose urbanity or the reverse was of real importance to their companions. They are adjudged to horse-doctors, corn-dealers, foreigners residing for pleasure in a city; in fact, to people so many and so various that we wonder how these honorary inscriptions can have been regarded as an honour.[1] Nevertheless, they have put it on record that in the Hellenistic world good manners were regarded as having a seriousness and an importance quite foreign to modern civilisation. Perhaps the Germanic elements in England and Prussia, with their rudeness in virtue, and their almost suspicion of good manners, have caused this change. I have indeed, in an Irish epitaph, which I have elsewhere quoted,[2] found a man praised for being "an affable superior and a polished equal." But this, which would have been a matter-of-course eulogy on a Hellenistic tombstone, strikes the modern observer as grotesque, if not indecent. The grave is, indeed, too solemn, and the question of the future life too serious, ever to admit of superficial considerations. But in Hellenistic days they were not superficial; human society was then the

---

[1] Such phrases as *ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν προσηκόντων οἷς δύσχερές ἐστι παραμυθεῖσθαι* (*IGSI.*, 760 = *CIG.*, 5838) are common. This subjectivity in post-mortem laudations is very characteristic.

[2] Here is a charming instance (*BCH.*, Vol. XII, p. 328 = Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 2d ed., No. 371): One Tyrannus, a freedman of the

---

emperor Claudius, who returned to his native town, Magnesia (Mæandri), as a fashionable physician, is publicly commended for having behaved *ὡς μηδένα ὑφ' αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν μεγέθους ἐπιβεβαρῆσθαι.*

[1] Indeed, Cicero (*pro Flacco*, 75, 76) ridicules them as meaningless. Domestic virtues often obtained this public recognition, and not unfrequently those of women; e. g., *CIG.*, 1433, on a Spartan woman whose only claim seems to have been sixty years of respectable married life. So youths of Tralles (*BCH.*, Vol. V, p. 340) are praised, not only for athletic victories, but *φιλοπονίας, εὐταξίας, εὐεξίας ἕνεκα.*

[2] *Art of Conversation*, p. 60.

great object of life, and whatever tended to improve and refine it was a real virtue, and a solid recommendation to the world. Thus we may explain this marked contrast in two phases of civilisation which present so many striking likenesses.

For an interesting parallel to the Greek epitaphs of one found at Rome, viz.:

Hospes quod deico paullum est— asta ac pellige
Heic ast sepulcerum hau pulcrum pulchrai feminæ
Nomen parentes nominarunt Claudiam
Suom Mareitum corde dilexit savo
Gnatos duos creavit horum alterum
In terra linquit, alium sub terra locat
Sermone lepido tum autem incessu commodo
Domum servavit lanam fecit. dixi—abei.[1]

---

[1] *CIL.*, 1007.

CHAPTER XII

EASTERN HELLENISM UNDER THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

In passing from West to East, from the newer acquisitions to the proper seat of the Greek life inaugurated by Alexander, we feel that we are provided with surer evidence and more details to guide us. In the first place, the indications of Strabo, which were hitherto (except for Rome and some spots in Italy) based upon hearsay, or upon the books of far older authors, and which even for Greece itself seem to rest upon second-hand knowledge, are upon Asia Minor and Egypt full and personal. Our author tells us frequently what he has himself seen, not what he has copied from others. In the next place, we have, for the times of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, not only the fabulous life and acts of Apollonius of Tyana—a most characteristic figure—but the orations of Dion Chrysostom, which give us many valuable details upon the city life of those days. The inscriptions from these parts of the Empire are also very numerous, and agree in suggesting that here, rather than in Greece proper, should we now look for the spiritual life of the Greeks. The prosperity of Asia remained, while that of Greece was ruined; a dozen cities in the former were richer and more populous than any of the famous old Greek capitals.

The final settlement of Roman Asia was practically that of Pompey; the great battles of the civil war were not fought out on Asiatic soil, and the considerate conduct of Augustus and Tiberius ultimately healed the wounds caused by the tyranny and the exactions of Brutus, Cassius, and Antony. Tiberius, indeed, was called upon to aid in a far different misfortune. The early years of his reign are marked in history as one of those periods when volcanic activity has been peculiarly mischievous. Many great cities were riven with earthquakes, and Strabo describes the whole rich region about Philadelphia as so disturbed and devastated with eruptions that the inhabitants had taken to the open country, and were afraid to trust themselves under any building. In our own day the island of Chio has been subject to like visitations. There is still preserved the copy of a monument set up by twelve great cities of Asia to Tiberius for his large and charitable subventions when they were subject to this calamity in various years from 17 to 29 A. D.[1] The copy was set up at Puteoli, and is a valuable specimen of the art notions of the period, for the cities are personified and represented in relief.[2]

But well might the cities set up memorials to Augustus and Tiberius; these rulers had saved the Hellenistic East from far worse than earthquakes—from the rapacities of the leaders in civil wars, and of the Roman nobles and knights who preyed as governors and capitalists upon the subjects of the Empire. This was, indeed, the Roman peace, which, if it turned many parts of Italy and Greece into a solitude, produced in Asia a prosperity greater than had ever been attained in that most populous and prosperous home of the Hellenic race. For the old Greek civilisation east of the Ægean had been a mere fringe on the coast, not reaching inland save in a few isolated spots. Now the whole heart of the peninsula was settled in great and flourishing polities—free cities with their territories, dynasts of more or less moderation under Roman supervision, and, what is perhaps more curious, religious polities, under the sovranty of a high-priest either hereditary or appointed by the local king from his immediate family.

---

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.*, ii, 47; *CIL.*, X, 1, p. 159, No. 1624.

[2] From this point of view it has been reproduced and discussed by Overbeck (*Griechische Plastik*, 2d ed., Vol. II, pp. 435 *sq.*). We have a corroborating inscription from Magnesia, dated by the thirty-third *potestas tribunalis* of the emperor, and so of the year 31 A. D., which calls him *κτιστὴς ἐνὶ καιρῷ δώδεκα πόλεων* (cf. *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 70).

These things remind us at once of mediæval parallels. The abbot of Monte Cassino, with his large territory and enormous wealth, was not unfrequently the brother of the Norman king of Apulia and Sicily. There were in modern Germany even in the nineteenth century prince-bishops, at Salzburg, Fulda, Würzburg, with similar secular powers, and this was so to some extent with the bishop of Durham. Such a polity was Pessinus, then a great mart for trade, and still ruled by priests who had been dynasts under the Attalid kings, and whose temple had been adorned by these kings in Hellenistic splendour. Such was Comana,[1] the great *entrepôt* for Armenian goods, to which all the Asiatic world streamed together when the Great Mother was brought out in solemn procession. Strabo speaks of it as another Corinth, with its luxurious life, its crowds of temple slaves living "by their bodies." Such were to a lesser extent Zela and Mylasa, each with its high-priest ruling in sacrosanct dignity. Such, as we now know, was the famous sanctuary and asylum of Hecate at Stratoniceia in Caria, which was a separate community, with its own population and precincts, under a ruling high-priest, though close beside the city.[1] Strabo even mentions in his own day a certain Cleon,[2] who was a bandit chief, at first useful to Pompey, then siding with Antony and Labienus, but who changed over so cleverly at the critical moment before Actium as to receive great rewards and consideration from the Octavian party; so he dropped the bandit and turned dynast, using as his cloak of respectability the fact that he was priest of the Abrettene Zeus, a Mysian god. At last he was promoted to the priesthood of Comana, which he had held only a month when he died, as a visitation, people said, for bringing swine's flesh into the priest's residence—an abomination as great there as it was to the Jews.

---

[1] Strabo, xii, 3. 36.

These sanctuaries seem all to have promoted trade and to have injured morals, even if we make some allowance for the naturalism sanctioned by many Asiatic cults. For the deities worshipped were in all cases Asiatic, even when called by Greek names, and their worship was of that orgiastic character called nature-worship, and is generally opposed to those civilised cults which have abandoned this conception of religion. The Romans did not interfere with such things more frequently than the English do with the rites and cults of their Indian subjects, and yet they kept as much control over the dynasts, priests, and free cities as the English do in India. Thus with a great deal of communal freedom, and the survival of dignities and emoluments, as well as even of titular sovranty, there was a certain solidarity attained under the suzerainty of Rome which was eminently useful in obviating border wars, privateering, raids by wild mountain tribes, and the other evils of multiplied independencies.

---

[1] Cf. *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 156. It was ravaged by Labienus and the Parthians. We have lists (*op. cit.*, p. 35) of great sacerdotal families, members of whom, including women, had enjoyed one year's high-priesthood, which was the culmination of a series of lesser priesthoods. Here, then, the title ἱερεὺς ἐξ ἱερέων means "noble."

[2] xii, 8. 9.

We shall do well to verify these general statements by some of the details to be found in our two authorities. For we may now quote Dion Chrysostom as well as Strabo, seeing that there was no serious change in life or society, though Dion's life and work in Asia Minor were two generations later than those of the geographer. The earthquakes had, indeed, diminished, and some emperors had supervened not so wise as Tiberius; but, on the whole, the management of the provinces was little altered, and the evidence of Dion, so far as we can judge, may be used in our sketch of this period.[1] Dion was also a traveller—indeed, a far greater traveller than Strabo—and went about, not only professionally, but also to see the world and its social curiosities. Like Strabo, he was a native of northern Asia Minor, of Prusa in Bithynia, and his many orations to Asiatic cities concerning his and their affairs show an intimacy with the same lands that Strabo knew. The information we obtain from Dion is fortunately of a different kind from that supplied by the geographer; it concerns the inner life, the jealousies, the quarrels of such rivals as Nicæa and Nicomedia; the disturbances at Apamea; the peculiarities of life in Rhodes, Tarsus, Alexandria. It is evidence to be supplemented, not only by the invaluable letters of Pliny from Bithynia, which sometimes tell the very same facts from an official point of view, but by the allusions in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the Epistles of St. Paul, which date from about the same period.

---

[1] In the same way we may say that, socially at least, and so far as we know it, the Greece of Plutarch had changed but little even from the Greece of Polybius, hardly at all from the Greece of the end of the first century B. C. But this inference may yet be considerably modified by further discoveries.

It is only recently that explorers, such as Messrs. Ramsay, Sterrett, Hogarth, Heberdey, and Fabricius, have begun to go through this country, and gather what still remains of inscriptions, in addition to those of the older travellers collected in Boeckh's *Corpus*, and Le Bas's *Voyage*. We may therefore expect to have our knowledge of this great and rich civilisation considerably enlarged as time goes on. The new Ilium of the Roman period, for example, was not recognised till the brilliant discoveries of Dr. Schliemann showed that the ancient and venerable site had received a new and handsome city upon the foundations of so many older settlements, and that it was even the head of a local confederation; we only knew that it was unusually favoured by the Romans for sentimental reasons, though this did not prevent Fimbria from devastating it in the Sullan time, and Agrippa from imposing upon the inhabitants an enormous fine for a misadventure to a Roman princess, which they could hardly have averted,[1] and which was remitted at the intercession of Herod the Great.

---

[1] Nicolaus Damascenus, *de vita sua*, frag. 3 (in Müller's *Fragg. Hist. Græc.*, Vol. III, p. 353).

We may give some account of these important centres of Hellenistic life, beginning from the northeast, the home of our authorities, and culling from them what still has some interest for the historian of social life. But we shall not tie ourselves to geographical lines, when we can find any stronger affinities to guide us. For there were cities which affected to be old, which were strictly conservative, boasting their mythical descent from Argos or Sparta, or even from a founding by Heracles or Dionysus;[1] and again those which were confessedly the foundations of Antigonus, Lysimachus, or the Attalids. Even these latter in many cases (notably that of Pergamum) invented some pre-existence in another condition to make themselves respectable. But all the genealogical trees of the Pergamenes could not make men believe that this upstart city was of such nobility as, for example, Miletus, where certain families still retained the name and the social dignity of royalty, owing to their descent from the Neleids, who led the first Ionic migration from Greece.[2]

It is difficult for the modern traveller who ventures into the heart of Asia Minor, and finds nothing but rude Kurds and Turkish peasants living among mountains and wild pastures, not connected even by ordinary roads, to imagine the splendour and rich cultivation of this vast country, with its brilliant cities and its teeming population. The two districts most praised by Strabo for fertility are the inner slope of the Caucasus, the present Georgia, and the slopes of Cappadocia descending to the Euxine.[1] Since the rise of Hellenism civilisation had spread into the interior, which now vied with the coast, and perhaps had more to show of peculiar and distinctive life. It was probably the greatness of Mithradates and of his predecessors that raised Pontus and Cappadocia into the first rank among the Asianic districts. Nicomedes of Bithynia[2] had founded Nicomedia, and there was already the older foundation of Nicæa,[3] in the same country. Sinope had been the capital of Mithradates' power, and no doubt an additional reason for the increased importance of the Pontic towns was the stimulus he and others gave to the Armenian and Indian trade, which came by the Caspian up the valley of the Cyrus, and so by the Black Sea to the west.

---

[1] So Dion, speaking at Nicæa (ii, 87), invokes "Dionysus, ancestor of this city, and Heracles, its founder, and Zeus Polieus and Athene and Aphrodite," etc., etc. It is highly characteristic that, while the cities claimed this remote origin, Dion says elsewhere it is not the right thing for the citizens to go back more than two steps in personal genealogies, for if you do, no one will be able to show that he belonged originally to any city. ii, 102: *τὸ γὰρ ἀπωτέρω δυοῖν βαθμοῖν ζητεῖν τὸ γένος οὐδαμῶς ἐπιεικές. οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτω τό γε ἀληθὲς ἐξ οὐδεμιᾶς εὑρεθήσεται πόλεως.* This might often be true in modern America.

[2] The antiquities of Ionia in this respect are given in detail in the opening chapters of Pausanias' seventh book (the *Achaica*).

The older Cappadocian dynasty of Ariarathes had evidently pursued a different policy, for their capital Mazaca, concerning which I have elsewhere spoken,[4] was in the very heart of the country, rather nearer the Pisidian coast. Strabo tells a strange story of one of these kings, named Ariarathes, who made himself a great artificial lake by damming up in this inner country one of the affluents of the upper Euphrates. The water broke loose and flooded the Cappadocian and Galatian country, causing such devastation that the king was obliged to pay his subjects, according to the arbitration of the Romans, 300 talents for damages (about £74,000). And yet when this dynasty died out, and the Romans offered Cappadocia "freedom and autonomy," that people, to the astonishment of all the sentimental doctrinaires, begged to be excused from accepting these great privileges, and asked for a king.[1]

---

[1] xii, 3. 15.

[2] Strabo does not profess to know which Nicomedes. But it must have been the first, for Polybius implies that Prusias I, his grandson, resided there.

[3] Originally the Antigoneia of Antigonus, founded in 316 B. C., but refounded and renamed by King Lysimachus.

[4] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 462.

The Bithynian cities, Nicæa, Nicomedia, and Apamea—the names recur often in other provinces, as if each founder desired thus to stamp his creations—are those which Dion Chrysostom in particular exhorts to lay aside their jealous rivalries, and agree to live in harmony and good-fellowship.[2] He tells us that they maintained an attitude of mutual enmity, not for any solid reason, but concerning the nominal primacy, to which each of them laid claim. In Strabo it is clearly Nicæa which is called the metropolis, but Nicomedia had been the old capital of Prusias, and therefore for a time superior.[3] Though Dion will not allow that there is anything beyond a quarrel of etiquette in this matter, he tells us elsewhere[4] that the right of having the Roman assizes held in a town gathered a great population into it, not only of lawyers and clients, but of idlers, artists, and worse people, all of whom spent money. The other attraction a city could possess was a great religious *panegyris* (the modern Kermesse), to which all the world streamed together, as they still do to such feasts in the Greek islands.[1] This was the real importance of the ecclesiastical cities with their high-priests. Here is, for example, what Dion says about Celænæ in Phrygia—a town of no prominence in history, and yet at this time great, populous, and wealthy:[2]

---

[1] xii, 2. 11.

[2] These very jealousies form the leading topic of Pliny's letters to Trajan, to which I shall revert.

[3] Cf. Mr. Hardy's instructive note on the relations of these two cities in his edition of *Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan*, p. 127. The term πρώτη πόλις was left to the Nicæans, but Nicomedia became the μητρόπολις, the residence of the proconsul, and the seat of the provincial council. The greater antiquity of Nicæa must have made her citizens peculiarly jealous of this.

[4] ii, 44. 98. I quote uniformly from the Teubner text, which is the only handy and critical one (ed. Dindorf, 1857).

> I see this city now second to none, and I congratulate it. For ye inhabit both the strongest and richest site on the continent, and have ample water and fertile land bearing ten thousand fold, with many flocks too and herds. The greatest and most profitable rivers have here their source, the Orbas, the Marsyas flowing through your city, and the Mæander. You command in situation Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria. Besides this, populous nations surround you, Cappadocians, Pamphylians, and Pisidians, to all of whom you afford a market and a meeting-place. You have also as subjects many cities without name, and many rich villages. But the greatest proof of your power is the amount of your tribute.
>
> Besides all this, the [Roman] assizes are held every second year (παρ' ἔτος) with you, and there comes together a countless crowd of people, plaintiffs, defendants, lawyers, officers, attendants, slaves, panders, jockeys, traders, courtesans, and artificers, so that whatever you have to sell obtains the highest price, and nothing lies idle in the city, neither carriages nor houses nor women. This is no small subvention. For wherever the greatest crowd collects, there of course most money is found, and the place is likely to prosper; and as I suppose the place where most

---

[1] Cf. the interesting chapter on the existing festival at Tino in Mr. Theodore Bent's *Cyclades*.

[2] ii, 43.

sheep are penned is most improved for agriculture by their dung, and men request shepherds to keep sheep upon their lands for this purpose, so the assizes are held to contribute most of all to a city's importance, and there is nothing sought after with such eagerness.[1] The principal cities obtain this privilege year about. But now they say the assizes will be changed at longer intervals, for that people will not tolerate being continually bustled about in all directions. You have also a share in the religious festivals of Asia, and receive as much of the outlay for them as the cities where the actual ceremonies take place.

I cite this interesting passage, which may have been written in the reign of the tyrannous Nero, or Domitian, as well as under Vespasian or Trajan, to show what the liberty and comfort of the Asiatic world were in the early Empire. Even the administration of the humane Cicero during the Republic, not to say the rule of Flaccus or of Cassius,[2] shows us very different features.

There is no allusion at this epoch to any undue or oppressive Roman interference, such as there must have existed a generation before the Christian era; there is, on the contrary, in inscriptions, much evidence of fulsome flattery of Rome in the very names of tribes as well as in eulogistic decrees.[3] The condition of the other cities of Asia Minor—Lystra, Iconium, Derbe, Ephesus, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, composed at a date between the evidence of Strabo and that of Dion—seems to be quite similar. There no interference with the public affairs of these towns —nay, not even with public disturbances consequent on the "right of public meeting," until a serious riot takes place. Then the town authorities are held responsible by the Romans, and perhaps punished or dismissed, or else the festival, which led to the disturbance, may have been suppressed for a time by the Roman governor. An interesting inscription from Ephesus contains an appeal to the proconsul L. Mestrius Florus (83–84 A. D.) to permit the celebration of the mysteries of *Demeter Thesmophorus* and *Carpophorus* and of the *Augustan gods*. It says that these feasts have been sanctioned by kings, emperors, and *yearly proconsuls*, as their letters testify. Even though fragmentary, this text is an important elucidation of the fears of the "town clerk" in the *Acts of the Apostles*, who tells the people that they run the risk of being held accountable for any uproar. A strike of bakers at Magnesia (Mæandri) is met by a severe rescript forbidding all unions among these tradesmen, and ordering them to obey the convenience of the public.[1]

---

[1] This picture of an assize town—either Sardis or Ephesus—is corroborated by a parallel passage at the close of Plutarch's tract comparing the passions of the soul and of the body.

[2] Above, pp. 164, 195.

[3] Cf. *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. XII, p. 176, for specimens from the inscriptions of the κοινόν of Bithynia. There are tribes called Σεβαστηνή, Γερμανική, Τιβεριανή; all therefore before the Flavian period; and a man is praised for being φιλοκαίσαρ and φιλορωμαῖος.

Tarsus stands before the rest as a remarkable centre of culture, the cradle of much of the Stoic thought, which has influenced the world from the preaching of St. Paul down to the austerities of his Puritan followers in this country.

We hear from Strabo[2] not only of its fair site, with the ice-cold Cydnus running through it, but that the inhabitants had such zeal for philosophy and education as to exceed Athens and Alexandria and every other place where such objects are pursued.

---

[1] Cf. Acts xix, 40, and *BCH.*, Vol. I, p. 209. Mytilene owed its privileges, forfeited for a while by its adherence to Mithradates, first to the influence of Pompey's *ancient* Theophanes, who is almost deified in extant inscriptions of the city; afterwards to a mission of Crinagoras and Potamon, to which I shall revert hereafter. On Magnesia cf. *BCH.*, Vol. VI, p. 565.

[2] xiv, 5. 13.

> But in this point they are peculiar, that the learners are all natives, and that hardly any strangers sojourn there; nor do the natives remain at home, but seek the completion of their education abroad, and then seldom return. In the other cities I have alluded to, excepting Alexandria, the reverse is the case, for thither many strangers come for the sake of education and dwell there, while of the natives few travel for that purpose, or indeed show a love of learning at home. The Alexandrians do both. They both receive many strangers, and go abroad themselves.

In fact, as he says elsewhere, Rome was crammed with Tarsian and Alexandrian educators.

This is the bright side of this peculiar and interesting metropolis. The shadows are supplied by Dion Chrysostom in the two curious *Orations to the Tarsians.* We need hardly lay much stress on the strange lecture he gives them for their universal habit of snoring, which he says they do even when awake, "whereas it is elsewhere exceptional even in sleepers, unless they be drunken or surfeited or lying in some awkward position."[1] He rings the changes upon this shocking social vice through twenty pages. The really instructive picture is given in the next speech, which is an appeal to lay aside, first, their internal jealousies and discords; secondly, their hostility and contempt towards their lesser neighbours—Mallus in particular. There was discord among the various classes of citizens—the counsel against the assembly, the old against the young, all against the president, whose office seems to have been peculiarly thankless. Outside all these was a large number of inhabitants without franchise, though born of parents and even ancestors native in Tarsus, but apparently needy labourers, who could not produce the 500 drachmæ necessary as a franchise qualification.[1] These people were courted or contemned, according to the political exigencies of the moment. The orator shows that such conduct is unworthy of a civilised community with distinguished traditions; that the quarrels with neighbouring cities are really ridiculous. "Whether the Ægeans quarrel with you, or the Apameans with Antioch [in Pisidia], or the Smyrnæans with Ephesus, they are all, as the proverb goes, contending for the ass's shadow. For the real power and presidency lie in other hands."[2]

---

[1] ii, 12.

These utterances of the great lay preacher show us a population rich and prosperous, intellectual and cultivated, but with the vices of the Greek character unextinguished in their hearts. It is quite plain that, were there not a Jupiter in their Olympus, careless perhaps and sleepy, easily imposed upon, and slow to wrath, but yet with the thunderbolt in his hands, and unapproachable in strength, we should have had over again the civil wars and strifes which had worn out the brilliant mother-country, till it passed through foreign domination to hopeless decay.

In a future chapter I shall revert to this subject in connection with the administration of Pliny under Trajan. The permanence of these features will perhaps be thus better impressed upon the reader. But before I revert to the now deserted and forlorn mother-country, it will be well to give from our two authors a picture of the three greatest centres of Hellenism outside Asia Minor—Rhodes, Alexandria, and Antioch.

---

[1] ii, 29.

[2] ii, 37.

The account of Rhodes given by Strabo labours, I think, under the same disadvantage as his account of Athens. I can find no trace of any personal observations in his description, and I cannot but suspect that he never visited the island. He says that the Colossus was still lying broken upon the ground, and he mentions the pictures of Protogenes—the Ialysos and the Resting Satyr. He says that the fortifications, the harbours, the streets, and other appointments are such that he can mention no equal, not to say superior, in the world. But there is not a word that he might not have copied from any of a dozen books, or heard from any traveller.[1] The very diffuse oration of Dion (xxxi) is a far more valuable source. The orator, indeed, applies himself throughout to one argument—his censure of the disgraceful habit of erasing the inscriptions on old statues and re-dedicating them to Roman legates. But in the course of his varied reasonings on so very obvious a matter he mentions a great many interesting particulars about this famous city.

He tells us that it was almost the only remaining Asiatic city where any fortifications remained, those of the rest having fallen into decay by reason of the prevailing peace and slavery. This is now the case with all the once walled cities of Ireland and Scotland, and of Germany. Not only were the fortifications allowed to decay, but the very materials were carried away for building in the suburbs. He says that the Rhodian walls were, indeed, no longer tested by enemies, but kept up by the taste of the citizens, as a sign of former greatness as well as of present affluence.[1] This wealth he asserts to be undoubtedly greater than that of any Greek city—I suppose in Hellas or Asia Minor—and he regards it as the direct result, not only of their energy and good government, but more especially of that commercial honesty for which they had long been celebrated in Greece.[2] More especially in the dreadful times of the last Roman civil war, when the city was captured by Cassius, and nothing left to the inhabitants but their houses, they showed after his plunder and exactions an example of mercantile honour unique in that part of the world. Augustus thought to relieve the excessive distress of the eastern provinces by permitting an abolition of debts.[3] While the other cities gladly accepted this supposed boon, the Rhodians steadily refused it, knowing that credit abroad was far more valuable than immediate profit at home. So they recovered their prosperity, and being now relieved of all expense as regards their navy or war preparations, possessing merely a couple of open men-of-war to bring their officials to Corinth, they had perhaps ampler resources than ever for the remaining duties of a leading Greek city—their internal administration, their public honours to distinguished friends, their philosophic schools, and their yearly feasts. This made Rhodes a favourite resort for many strangers, especially Romans, all of whom were subdued and improved in manners by the strict, chaste, cultivated tone of the citizens, the order and sobriety of the thoroughfares, the artistic beauty of the temples and public monuments.[1]

---

[1] Strabo, xiv, 2. 5 *sq.*

---

[1] i, 387. Let me add from Plutarch (περὶ φιλοπλουτίας, 5): Stratonicus used to ridicule the extravagance of the Rhodians, saying that they built as if they were immortal, but ate as if they were creatures of a day.

[2] Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 333.

[3] Dion, i, 367: ὅθεν πᾶσιν ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔξωθεν χρεῶν ἄφεσις.

The number of these last was quite extraordinary now at the end of the first century; for while Roman emperors and generals had long indulged in the habit of plundering Greek cities to adorn palaces and temples at Rome, by some extraordinary good fortune Rhodes had escaped. Nay, even Nero, who was so ruthless about this as not to refrain from the monuments of Olympia and Delphi—the holiest of shrines—and who even carried off most of the statues on the Acropolis of Athens, as well as many from Pergamum (which he considered his private property), not only left the Rhodians unplundered, but when his art agent Acratus came round to that city and the citizens were naturally in dismay, this man, who had searched and plundered every village in the civilised world, astonished them by saying that he only came to see the place, from which he had no permission to remove anything.[2] But the Rhodians, whose own laws as regards the defacing of a statue or inscription, the stealing of a spear or tripod from a statue's hand, were stringent unto death, were now so degraded by the slavery of former days that they thought it necessary to honour, not only every emperor, but every Roman prætor; and for this purpose their president (στρατηγός) would simply order the inscription under some old statue to be erased, and a new dedication to be inscribed.[1] This latter was also done in the case of ancient statues not named, as having been set up to gods or to heroes too well known for description.[2] In such cases it was actually sacrilegious. But it was at least ridiculous in the case of mere portrait statues, when some old man was presented, not only with a statue, but with youth, a weak man with great muscles; when a sybarite who always went in his litter stood forth in bronze as a boxer in the Rhodian streets. And as actors successively undertook various parts, so these statues played various characters in turn, undoing the reputation of the city for gratitude and for an honourable adherence to its old decrees.

---

[1] That this was no mere rhetorical flattery appears from the fact that Dion brings it out again in his lecture to the Alexandrians, with whom he contrasts the Rhodians most favourably: *ἴστε Ῥοδίους ἐγγὺς ὄντας ὑμῶν ζῶντας ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ καὶ μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας, ἀλλὰ παρ' ἐκείνοις οὔτε τὸ δραμεῖν ἐν τῇ πόλει δοκεῖ μέτριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ξένων ἐπιπλήττουσι τοῖς εἰκῇ βαδίζουσι.* And on this he comments at length.

[2] i, 394.

The orator's argument shows, I think, rather a disregard of very old statues than any graver vice.[3] And yet Rhodian language, Rhodian eloquence, Rhodian manners, were all redolent of antiquity, and represented the most conservative society in the Greek world at this time.

We turn to the vastly different city of Alexandria, described in the very next speech of Dion (xxxii), but also seen by Strabo, who here, as usual, leaves us in no doubt, when he has anything personal to tell us, of his actual visit. Still his description is but sketchy and partial, and makes us long that we had even such a traveller as Pausanias to give us his impressions. Unfortunately, what is very well known is often least talked about in any book intended for contemporaries, and many interesting and important things in every age are passed over in silence by those who spend time and labour upon obscure and trifling oddities. There is not a step in our enquiry into social life where we have not this very inconvenient fact causing us constant perplexities. Let us turn then to the account of Strabo,[1] from which I cull various details not all strictly Hellenistic, to give the reader an impression of what a cultivated tourist at this time thought worthy of notice.

---

[1] Possibly this new dedication to a Roman saved the statue from being carried off, or they knew cases where it had saved statues; so that it may have been merely a precaution.

[2] Philo, *Legatio in Caium*, 20, describes the mob of Alexandria hurrying an old battered bronze equestrian statue from the gymnasium, and setting it up in the principal synagogue as a statue of Caligula. It had been dedicated by the first Cleopatra.

[3] P. 347. He hints very plainly that most people now thought all the various gods really modifications of the same Being, so that a change in dedication, if confined to gods, was of little import.

There is something curiously modern about his travels in this land of wonders. There was, of course, a vast number of splendid buildings and tombs which have now disappeared, and there were still large and populous cities on the site of Memphis and at Ptolemais in the Thebaid. But, taking Cairo now to represent the former, there was perhaps only the one more large city in Egypt; for the account he gives of Thebes, inhabited in separate villages, with only its ruined temples to tell of its ancient splendour, might almost be written by any of the tourists who now visit Luxor. He was in the train of Ælius Gallus, the Roman prefect, and mentions how, with a large retinue, they went to hear the music of the statue of Memnon. At dawn he, indeed, heard the sound, but will not affirm that it really proceeded from the statue; he evidently thinks it was produced by some of the many natives or priests who were crowding round the feet and had even climbed up on its knees. As is now settled by the researches of Letronne,[1] it was the earthquake of 27 B. C. which broke the statue, and exposed the heart of the stone to the air—a cause sufficient to produce a crackling sound upon sudden changes of temperature. The many inscriptions—Latin and Greek—of tourists who say they did, or did not, hear the sound, reach down to the days of Septimius Severus, who repaired the broken part with rude masonry, and silenced forever the mysterious voice.

---

[1] xvii, 1. 6 *sq.*

This was the sort of thing Strabo and his Roman patron went to see. They watched in the Fayyum the feeding of the sacred crocodiles, whose mouths were pulled open by the attendants, and their food stuffed in; and he tells of a similar exhibition of crocodiles at Rome. He notes that the Egyptian priests had forgotten all their knowledge, and ridicules one Chæremon,[2] who was with them at Heliopolis, and who pretended to interpret the hieroglyphics. He is very explicit on the labyrinth, which is now gone, and Lake Mœris; but at Aswan and Philæ he saw hardly more than we see, and was most interested by the natives shooting the cataracts in their boats, which they did in our time, for money, till the great dam upset their trade. But when he says that between

---

[1] *La statue vocale de Memnon.*

[2] Not to be confounded with the Chæremon who was librarian at Alexandria till 40 A. D., when he went to Rome as tutor to Nero. He was also a ἱερογραμματεύς, and really understood the hieroglyphics, as we may infer from his fragments in Müller's *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, Vol. III (cf. also *BCH.*, Vol. I, p. 122).

Aswan and Philæ he saw pieces of diorite lying about, he is hardly to be believed, for he makes the wonderful statement that the third pyramid—that of Menkara, which we still see covered with slabs of red granite from Syene—was made of black diorite! Nor does he mention the great sphinx at all, though he comments on avenues of sphinxes at Memphis, partly covered up with sand. He describes the population as we now should, a very industrious and numerous peasantry, bringing up all their children (instead of exposing them), but wholly unwarlike, inasmuch as nine cohorts of Roman infantry, with a few troops of cavalry, were perfectly able to keep the country quiet. Of these, one-third was on the southern frontier (Syene), one-third was required for Alexandria alone. For the rest of Egypt, as Dion says,[1] was a mere body provided for Alexandria to use, or rather a mere appendage to it.

I have given in a former volume[2] the details known to us about this great city in earlier days; what is now to be added should be compared with what I have there said, and need not here repeat.[3] The government of the city, as indeed of all Egypt, was not altered in principle by the Romans.[4] The lord-lieutenant of Augustus controlled the old Ptolemaic officers, who in their turn controlled the native officers, found by Ptolemy in the old native system of government, which he, we are told, did not change in any important principle. The city had from the outset been peopled with many races, and nevertheless preserved a very constant and peculiar character, though we are told that the Greek element had been almost exterminated by the ninth Ptolemy, and though we may be sure that the Macedonian element now gave little but its ancient and once glorious name to the dominant classes. The Jews had largely increased in number and importance here and all through Egypt.[1] We must also never forget the strange power possessed by every land, especially so peculiarly uniform and unchangeable a land as Egypt, of assimilating foreigners whose offspring, even apart from that of "mixed marriages," gradually conforms to the national type. Of this we have signal examples in the assimilation of hordes of Slavs and Albanians into the Greek people; in the assimilation of hordes of Northmen and English settlers into the Irish type. Thus, though the language of Alexandria was principally Greek, though all the foundations of the Ptolemies were professedly Greek (and it is noted as remarkable in Cleopatra that she could even speak the old Egyptian language), nevertheless the city and its population became gradually less and less Hellenistic, and reverted to the Egyptian, or to an Egyptian, type. There was a certain wild love of noisy and reckless pleasure, especially in feasts and competitions, combined with fierce superstition and strong faith in the supernatural quite foreign to Greek character.[1] There was bound up with much *bonhommie*, with much love of sarcasm and ridicule, with much levity under injustice and oppression, a vein of iron determination to resist at a certain point, of horrible cruelty in taking revenge, which is to be paralleled in only very few cities, ancient or modern. The Alexandrians' love of pleasure was not keener than their love of business; their immorality not more shocking than their superstition; their barbarism not more pronounced than their culture—a strange public, sometimes deadly to play with, sometimes easy to oppress, with a temper never safe to forecast, and at times as resolute in resistance as if they had been all Jews or Carthaginians.

---

[1] *ἡ γὰρ Αἴγυπτος, τηλικοῦτον ἔθνος, σῶμα τῆς πόλεώς ἐστι, μᾶλλον δὲ προσθήκη* (i, 412).

[2] *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 160 *sq.*

[3] We have Botti's researches in, and new map of, Alexandria, Milne's *Roman Egypt*, and Wilcken's *Ostraka*, not to mention Grenfell and Hunt's great discoveries in papyri. But they do not add much to our knowledge of Alexandria.

[4] Cf. below, pp. 288, 289, for reservation.

---

[1] Strabo says that the papyrus-growers of the Delta were in his day emulating the Jewish policy of limiting the culture of balm in Gilead, that the price might increase and a monopoly be created; and here he suggests the beginning of that regrettable neglect or mismanagement which permitted the total disappearance of this precious product from the land of Egypt. The only papyrus now growing wild in any country known to me is that in the Anapus near Syracuse. A dwarf kind fringed, till lately, the rocks in the First Cataract. There are still masses of it in the Soudanese Nile. But both lotus and papyrus, and the great Egyptian bean from which the natives made cups, seem gone forever from the Delta.

In the myriad quarrels of their own Ptolemaic dynasty they always took a strong and even violent, though not always a consistent, part; when the Romans succeeded to the dominion, we find the Alexandrians in every case siding with the East against the West—with Pompey, the hero of the East, against Cæsar; with Antony, who made himself one with their fascinating queen and her interests, against Augustus. Nowhere did the great Julius meet so obstinate and dangerous a national resistance; and though Augustus encountered no such difficulties upon his arrival in pursuit of Antony, he marked his successful landing and defeat of the national party by founding another Nicopolis close to Alexandria, as he had done near the promontory of Actium. The jealous care with which the emperor excluded all senators from Egypt, and kept it a close domain under his own immediate servants, must have arisen from what he saw of the dangers of Alexandria and its terrible mob; for everybody must have told him how completely pacific and docile was the population of the rest of Egypt. Since the ruin of Thebes, in the days of Ptolemy Lathyrus, we never hear of an internal disturbance. Nor can the modern traveller conceive such a thing possible. The Fellahs are, indeed, to use the words of Plautus, *patientissimum genus hominum.*[1] But not so the ancient Alexandrians. The great series of palaces built by successive Ptolemies which Strabo saw, the dockyards, the arsenals, were indeed empty; but the parks and colonnades, the gymnasia and temples with their grounds, the *Sema* with its Alexander, now cased in glass instead of gold, the Museum with its Fellows meeting in their common hall—all these Hellenistic features remained intact. Its streets were full of life, of business and pleasure, and it ranked without question as the second city of the world both to Strabo and to Dion.[2]

---

[1] There seems, therefore, to be truth in the expression of Philo the Jew (*Leg.*, 18), who calls them *ὁ Ἀλεξανδρέων μιγὰς καὶ συμπεφορημένος ὄχλος*, and accuses them indiscriminately of beast-worship (20 *sub fin.*), though this is the testimony of a bitter hater of the Greeks as enemies of his own nation.

---

[1] Unless they were inhabitants of the three or four Greek cities in Egypt, they could never attain the freedom of Alexandria. Unless they had obtained this latter privilege, they were considered ineligible for Roman citizenship by the emperors. This appears from an interesting correspondence between Trajan and Pliny concerning a certain Harpocras, whom the emperor, at Pliny's instance, had ignorantly made a Roman citizen in ignorance of this rule (cf. Pliny, *Epist.*, v–viii, *ad Traianum*).

[2] Cf. Dion, *Orat.*, i, 412.

Dion begins his very severe lecture or sermon to the Alexandrians by describing their extraordinary frivolity, their devotion to sport and laughter, their complete want of seriousness. Yet we know that in the first trading city of the East there must have been many diligent and serious people, not to mention the Fellows and students at the Museum. But through the whole of the speech he never directly mentions these richly endowed college Dons either for good or evil. Naturally the itinerant preacher in his worn cloak, whose presence was mean and his speech nothing extraordinary,[1] would feel a certain jealousy or dislike for these endowed officials. The following passage[2] seems to me to do more than ignore them. He is asking his audience not to interrupt him, or call out impatiently: "When will the jugglery (or some other worthless amusement) begin":

> For these you have always with you, and there is no fear of their failing you; but such discourses as will profit the city, and make men wiser and better, you seldom hear—I will not say never. This, indeed, is not your fault, as you will show by listening to me to-day; it rather lies with the so-called philosophers; for some of them never go near the public, and will not make the venture, perhaps despairing of improving the crowd, while those in the so-called public lecture-rooms make a mere display of voice (*φωνασκοῦσιν*), admitting only hearers bound by fixed conditions and tame to their hand. But of those called Cynics there is no small number in the city, an influx of them having taken place as of other things—men who have no knowledge, not even of the most vulgar kind, but merely seek a

---

[1] *ἐγὼ δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐδεὶς οὐδαμόθεν ἐν τριβωνίῳ φαύλῳ μήτε ᾄδειν ἡδὺς μήτε μεῖζον ἑτέρου φθεγγόμενος* (i, 407). Yet elsewhere he confesses that he was called *the nightingale of Sophists*.

[2] P. 402.

living; these in the crossways and lanes and gateways of temples collect and impose upon children and sailors and such like with jokes and buffoonery, and answering riddles. Wherefore these people instead of good do the greatest harm, teaching the thoughtless to despise philosophers, as if one were to teach children to despise their masters. But of those who come before you as educated men, some make oratorical displays, and some compose poems which they sing to you, knowing that you love music. If these people pose as rhetors or poets, it does no harm; but if they pose as philosophers, for the sake of lucre and vainglory, and not for your benefit, then they are indeed mischievous. It is as if a physician called in to see the sick were to disregard their symptoms and bring them garlands, and courtesans, and unguents.

I suppose that at the opening of this passage he must have had the professors of the Museum in his mind. His main object is, however, to contrast himself, not with these, but with those other itinerant teachers who were, as I have elsewhere remarked, like the begging Franciscan monks in the Europe of former days.[1] The crowd which they addressed included women and children; for these, as was remarked by observers two centuries earlier, were constantly in the streets, and added vastly to any public disturbance. The whole town lived, Dion says, for excitement, and when the manifestation of the god (Apis) took place, all Alexandria went fairly mad with concerts and horse-races. When doing their ordinary work they were apparently sane, but the instant they entered the theatre or the race-course they appeared as if poisoned by some intoxicating drug, so that they no longer knew or cared what they said or did. And this was the case even with women and children, so that when the show was over, and the first madness past, all the streets and byways were seething with excitement for days, like the swell after a storm. The strange point is that Persians and Bactrians, who must ride for the sake of their liberty or their wars, have no such madness; but the Alexandrians, who never ride or touch a horse, go mad over these contests, like lame men contending about foot-races.

---

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 373.

All this reminds us strongly of the similar mania in Byzantium when the Blues and the Greens were important factors in state revolutions and successions.[1] The same unmannerly excitement took place when they went to hear singers or actors, the whole audience hanging upon their words or notes, as if felicity were acquired through the ears, and calling some wretched professional their god and saviour because he satisfied their craving. It is curious that all this excitement was derived from singing with the cithara, not the flute, for accompaniment. What would have happened had this more exciting instrument been used it is hard to say.

For the humours of this maddened crowd often proceeded to murder, and no one who thwarted them for a moment was safe. I spoke in a former chapter of the Roman who was "lynched" because he killed a cat. The same thing would no doubt have happened a century later, for Juvenal tells of the atrocities which occurred in a local quarrel between Ombi and Tentyra,[2] and the picture of that Roman Swift cannot be wholly imaginary. Dion, indeed, admits particularly (p. 404) the very religious character of the people. But he tells them plainly that while their religion consists in violent emotions, in miracles, in omens, in strange providences, in a multiplicity of gods, true religion consists in rational views, in ordinary providence, in the conduct of everyday life; not in madness and in mystery.

---

[1] Cf. Mr. Bury's *Later Roman Empire*, Vol. I, p. 338. In Suetonius (*Caligula*, 55) the *prasina factio* already appears; and (*Nero*, 22) "*querentibus dominis factionum.*" Mr. L. C. Purser gives me as even earlier instances Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, vii, 186 (perhaps 20 B. C.), and Ovid, *Am.*, iii, 2. 76.

[2] *Satires*, xv.

It may naturally be thought that the complexion of inner Egypt which appears in Dion Chrysostom and in Juvenal points to a failure in the Romans to restore peace and prosperity to the Egypt racked and impoverished by the decadent Ptolemies—Auletes and Cleopatra VI; and this is so far true that for nearly a century from the Roman occupation we hear of frequent local riots, both in Alexandria and in the upper country, arising mainly from the jealousies of the Jews and Greeks, but also from the oppression of tax-gatherers and other officials in the provinces. Yet we know that both Augustus and Tiberius did their best to reform abuses and promote the agriculture which had become a new necessity to Rome; for without Alexandrian exports the Roman mob could not be supplied with sufficient doles of corn. Accordingly, Egypt had been seized by Augustus as his private share in the loot of the East, and he organised it afresh with a view to his own interests.

It has been said ever since Strabo, and even by Mr. Milne, that the Romans simply took over the administration of the country established by the Ptolemies, and changed nothing. When I have had reason to test Strabo's statements, I have generally found him untrustworthy. In the present case there is evidence on the very surface to confute him. If the administration of the Ptolemies was, indeed, adopted without change, why was the whole official nomenclature altered? I will not count the *eparch*, who was necessarily new, being the vice-regent of Cæsar, and entrusted with general powers in various departments. But why does the *dioiketes* disappear, and with him the *epistatœ*, the *chrematistœ*, the *plylakitœ*, the *epimeletœ?* And why are they replaced by people called *idiologus*, *archedicastœ*, *eirenophylakes*, *euschemones*, etc.? Almost the only common name among the Ptolemaic officials that remains is the *strategus;* yet the catalogue of titles seems considerably increased. To ascertain the various duties of these people is a thankless task, as may be seen from several recent efforts, and no inferences regarding social life can as yet be deduced from our texts. But I think it likely that the constant unrest of the very patient population up to the advent of the Flavian house is an index that there were far-reaching changes in the bureaucracy corresponding to the wholesale change of titles, and that it took two or three generations to break the country people into a new form of slavery. The Pharaohs had been bad enough; the Ptolemies probably worse; but this new despotism, with no appeal or hope of escape, was probably worst of all. Yet even this was finally successful. The latest historian of Roman Egypt, Mr. Milne, speaks of a century of prosperity indicated by a great increase in the circulation of money.[1]

The recovery of papyri from the century round the Christian era has been as yet comparatively unsuccessful;

---

[1] This is inferred from the proportions in which successive epochs are represented in the great find at Bacchias and Karanis in the Fayyum; cf. Milne's *Roman Egypt*, Appendix IV, note ix.

and possibly this may be due to the depression of the country. From the close of the first and from subsequent centuries Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, and many other explorers, have brought back thousands of fragments; the Rainer collection (Vienna) and that of Berlin are as large as that of the British Museum, and there are many smaller at Geneva, Heidelberg, and even in America. The great mass of them are mere contracts, loans, official orders, and other uninteresting and unsuggestive documents. But among them are not a few scraps of literature—the remains of the good books, from Homer to Menander, read in the Fayyum and in the Thebaid. There are also specimens of a literature actually fresh, and unlike anything which the myriad variety of the Greeks had as yet vouchsafed to us. In the first place, we find that the *Mimes* of Herondas, which date from the earliest generation of Egyptian literature, and which, like the *Adoniazusæ* of Theocritus, go back to an ancient and celebrated original, the *Mimes* of Sophron—these pictures of low life found their imitations in later days, and apparently with dramatic intent. The fragment found by Grenfell and Hunt (*Oxyrynch. Pap.*, IV) is on the back of a dramatic piece, and probably intended likewise for performance rather than for reading. So also the lament of a discarded maiden, which has its touching prototype in Theocritus' second idyll, appears to us in dramatic form, and intended for some sort of stage. If these inferences be just, we must conceive the Hellenistic society of Upper Egypt replacing the costly production of the old Greek plays by these far simpler pieces, which would stand to the older drama in a similar relation as that of our music-hall entertainments to our theatres.

I have already (p. 80) given an account of what the first editors, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, rightly ventured to call a music-hall farce, evidently put upon the local stage of Oxyrynchus. An interesting question is thus started: What was the diffusion of this sort of Hellenism through the towns and villages of Upper Egypt? I see no reason to limit this later form of culture, protected and promoted by the Roman power, to any narrow limits, or to mere Ptolemaic foundations. There was certainly a garrison of Roman soldiers stationed here and there in Egypt—Strabo tells us so—and these people could enjoy Greek amusements. In the pages of the *Corpus Inscr. Græc.* (Nos. 5050 *sqq.*) will be found various Greek inscriptions from the temples of Dakkeh-Kalabsheh, now, I suppose, swamped by the barbarous reservoir at Philæ, and never again to be studied in our day. These I copied again in 1893, and added to the number one by a Roman called Maximus. They are principally votive inscriptions, proving perhaps the piety, certainly the leisure, of members of the Roman garrison in Egypt. It is more than likely that local players, less important and exacting than the Dionysiac guild at Ptolemais, provided for the amusement, or beguiled the ennui, of the Hellenistic garrison, and of such other travellers and traders as may have sojourned even as far up as the towns in Nubia. Amid the solemn stupidity of the Roman-Greek papyri found in Egypt, which consist in enumerations, demands, complaints regarding the burdens of the people, some ray of light into their happier moments is indeed most welcome. But alas! in every age the gaiety and laughter of the world is seldom committed to permanent documents, least of all in this Hellenistic age, which, as I have elsewhere observed, is notoriously wanting in humour. Among the hundreds of literary fragments found on these papyri, I do not believe that we have recovered a single scrap of Aristophanes!

There is yet another branch of literature in which we can now say that Roman Egypt anticipated the latest bloom of Greek letters. The Greek prose novels, to which the Middle Ages and even Shakspere owe so much, were hitherto commonly attributed to the days of the "Sophistical revival;" in other words, to the late second and following centuries. They are published in a column called the *Love-Tale Writers*,[1] and among them is that jewel, the *Daphnis and Chloe*, which has excited so many translations and imitations. In a former volume[2] I have shown the eastern origin of these stories, and their invasion of Alexandria at a far earlier date; nor did I ever subscribe to the theory of their late origin in Greek literary history. We now have distinct evidence on this question. Some years ago I purchased in the Fayyum a stray column — we should say a stray page — of a prose work, of which the *verso* shows accounts of the Flavian epoch (roughly 70–90 A. D.). The text is a passage from a hitherto unknown novel, exactly on the lines of the later books of the kind. It describes the departure of the lovers (?) in two separate ships from somewhere near Miletus, on a voyage down towards Crete. A terrible storm arises, of which a turbid description fills the remainder of the column.[3]

---

[1] *Scriptores Erotici Græci*, Teubner.

[2] *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 253 *sq.*

[3] First published, with facsimiles, in the proceedings of the *Accad. dei Lincei*, 1897, and then more fully and completely by Professor Smyly in *Hermathena*, No. XXVII.

Such are the traces of educated life we have found in the Roman Egypt of the period now before us.

The reader may naturally wonder that I have yet said nothing about the other great Hellenistic capital, which, if it could not vie with Alexandria in literary importance, yet certainly surpassed it vastly in charm. The narrow valley of the Orontes, with its rapid and clear stream, with the overhanging mountains, with the enchanting resort of Daphne close by in the hills, with all the sordidness of its tideless harbours and the untidiness of the quays removed twelve miles, and all this in a fine climate, must have been the most delightful residence in the known world. The Greek settlers, as in Alexandria, became interfused with natives—here Syrian and Jews. But there was a counterbalance in Syria which was lacking in Egypt; I mean the crowd of Macedonian and Greek foundations, not only in the vicinity, but along the Jordan valley (the Decapolis). Apamea and Laodicea on the upper Orontes were great cities, where large garrisons and parks of elephants were kept. Seleucia, near the mouth of the Orontes, was a fortress of the last importance; we may therefore infer that Antioch must have held a far more Hellenistic society than Alexandria. But alas! our information concerning it is almost nothing. Even the learning of Mr. Bevan, the most recent historian of the Seleucids, has been unable to raise the mist that covers early Antiochene life. Their public relations to Rome are almost all that we know. The vagaries of Antiochus Epiphanes, and his wonderful feast, are but the eccentricities of a semi-insane despot. The claims of the Jews to recognition and to privileges, of which Josephus speaks, are to us obvious enough, seeing that they were urged at Alexandria also, where their importance was probably not so great. But all these external relations do not tell us how people lived and worked there. Till the days of John Chrysostom, the preacher, we have no personal speaking to the Antiochene mob, no criticism of their vices and follies. Strange to say, Dion Chrysostom, who lectures Rhodians, Alexandrians, and Tarsians, has left us no address delivered at Antioch. I know of no historian of Antioch whose fragments survive. The account of Strabo is unusually bad, and evidently a mere second-hand description from old books. He tells us of the legends invented by Seleucus I and his priests to give Hellenic dignity to the new foundations, but about its condition in his own day not a word.

The misfortunes of the site have told terribly against the preservation of any of its splendours, its inscriptions, its houses. There were no sands of Egypt there wherein to hide mummies, and where papyrus rolls might last for ever. The overhanging mountains may have been terraced with rock tombs, but a terrible series of earthquakes, persecuting the city for centuries, has apparently tumbled great masses of rock from the cliffs, and buried the ancient city in such a way as to make excavation seem hitherto hopeless. Yet surely on the well-determined site, which even preserves the ancient name (Antakia), adequate research will some day disclose the sites of temples, the circuit of the walls, and possibly many inscriptions. These are but vague hopes, expressed without any first-hand knowledge of the place. May they induce some men of wealth and leisure to seek whether this most brilliant seat of Hellenism, so closely attached to the history of our religion, may not again be brought within the reach of modern learning!

There is but one common feature belonging to all the cities we have contrasted—their political insignificance. To the Rhodians the orator can hold out no higher ambition than the giving of splendid feasts, which (like the exhibitions in our capitals) would bring together visitors, and spread the popularity of the city, and thus its wealth and social influence. To the Alexandrians the highest hope he protends is a possible visit from the emperor himself, if he hears of their good conduct.[1] We know from Philo that they had been grievously disappointed by the death of Caligula, who had determined upon a state visit of this kind. Nero disappointed them in like manner.[2] Yet when Hadrian came, a generation later, the result was not mutual satisfaction, but estrangement.

---

[1] i, 398, 433.

[2] This is now inferred by Mr. Milne from an Alexandrian coin struck in honour of the proposed visit, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CONDITION OF GREECE FROM AUGUSTUS TO VESPASIAN—THE HELLENISM OF THE EARLY EMPERORS

We come back to the true home of Greek life, the inmost hearth from which the sacred fire of Greek culture has often been carried with such copious hands as to leave scarce a spark to illumine the old country. Yet over and over again, after brilliant centuries of Asiatic or western Hellenedom or Hellenism, the old rough nurse of liberty, of art, and of refinement has reasserted her pre-eminence and proved that no other land can ever appropriate her title to be the foster-mother, if not the mother, of European culture.

Were we to trust implicitly the eloquence of Dion addressed to the Rhodians, the sun of Greece had reached its nadir in his day. He refuses to take the example of Athens as any precedent:

> Athens, which has hailed as *Olympian* some nobody, not even a born citizen, but a Phœnician, and not even from Tyre or Sidon, but from some inland village; which has not only set up in bronze, but beside Menander, some cheap poet, who exhibited here before you—this may well be cited in pity for the condition into which the whilome leaders of the Greeks have now fallen.[1]

And again:

> Formerly the reputation of Greece was sustained by many—the Athenians, Spartans, Thebans, nay, Corinthians and

---

[1] i, 383.

> Argives in turn. But now they are all gone—some actually destroyed, while others are disgraced by the acts you hear of, and are ruining their ancient fame, thinking this a luxury, poor souls, and again, that no one prevents them from further degrading themselves. So far as these are concerned, there is no reason that the Greeks were not long since below the level of Phrygians and Thracians. There is nothing but the stones and the ruins of their buildings to show the old splendour of Greece, since even the Mysians would repudiate the present inhabitants and politicians as their descendants. Hence it is that I even consider the totally destroyed cities as the most fortunate, since our memories of them at least are safe and not soiled by recent events; for is it not better that the bodies of the dead should be buried out of our sight than that they should putrefy before our eyes?[1]

And with this agrees the letter of Apollonius of Tyana, in which he writes to the Museum of Alexandria: "I have become barbarised, not by staying long away from, but by staying long in, Greece."[2] In estimating these texts we must, however, make considerable allowance for the desire at the moment to extol Rhodes, and indeed Asianic Hellenism, at the expense of the ancient capitals of Hellenic life.

For there is considerable reason to think that the days of Dion were by no means the worst which Greece had seen, but that a considerable revival had taken place since its complete exhaustion after the great civil wars, and their drain upon life and property. It is true, and very remarkable, that Asia Minor revived, and recovered her commercial prosperity with promptitude and lasting success, whereas that of Greece can hardly ever be called flourishing again till the trade in silk and in currants made some stir in Justinian's time. Still there were always certain articles of export which, in other days and with other habits, would have employed much industry. Horses from the now extended pastures of the depopulated country, oil from other provinces as well as Attica, honey from the slopes of Mount Hymettus, were always prized. Far more profitable to Greece was the production—no longer as a fine art, but as a trade—of statues at Athens and elsewhere for the adornment of Asiatic and Italian temples;[1] so were the famous marble quarries of the Cyclades, which seem, however, like the gold and silver mines, to have been often a monopoly of the Roman fiscus, and thus less productive than might be expected.[2]

---

[1] i, 397.

[2] *Epist.*, 34: ἐβαρβαρώθην οὐ χρόνιος ὢν ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος ἀλλὰ χρόνιος ὢν ἐν Ἑλλάδι.

But the effect of this trade is seen only in scattered and special localities, such as Corinth, Patræ, Tithorea, and Hypata; the last two described by Plutarch[3] and Apuleius (if we can believe him) as flourishing, evidently owing to recent and special causes. In most parts of Greece landed property had passed into the hands of large proprietors; the *Latifundia*, which had long since destroyed the yeomanry of Italy, had produced the same effect in the Hellenic peninsula; the general influx of the pauper rural population into the towns, upon which I wrote in a former volume,[1] had increased the evil; and we now find a population which appears to do nothing but assemble in sham political unions, or attend public feasts and games; to enjoy the amusements provided for them by the liberality either of the State or of wealthy individuals; to pass resolutions and decrees of gratitude and of deification to those who satisfied their sordid wants; and occasionally to riot for amusement or owing to some trivial cause of offence.

---

[1] Cf. the curious chapter in Philostratus (*Vita Apoll.*, v, 20). Plutarch tells us (*Publicola*, 17) that the pillars for the restored Capitol under Domitian were made at Athens of Pentelic marble, and of admirable proportions, but were spoilt by repolishing at Rome, which made them too slight for their height.

[2] The late Prince Victor of Hohenlohe, who had tried several specimens of Parian marble for his statues, told me that the old Greeks seem to have exhausted the sound parts of that quarry. All the pieces brought to him had cracks or flaws, which made them useless.

[3] *Sulla*, 15, and the opening of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius.

The only serious disputes of this age seem to be about boundaries of territory, and every such dispute of which we hear seems to have occupied years of litigation or arbitration. Such was a dispute between the community of Daulis and one of its rich citizens as to the boundaries of an estate he had acquired, as it bordered on or invaded the public land of the commune.[2] But what was this quarrel of perhaps ten years, which we could easily match with a chancery suit, compared with the ancient feud between Sparta and Messene, which took the form of a claim of both for the *ager Dentheliates* on the west slope of Taygetus? After many decisions and reversals of decisions, the affair was apparently settled in favour of Messene by Tiberius and the Senate, who reviewed all the claims and counterclaims since the first Messenian war.[3]

---

[1] *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 326 *sq.*

[2] Cf. Hertzberg, Vol. II, p. 152, who gives the details from an inscription in *I. G. Sept.*, III, 1. 61 = *CIG.*, 1732. Other cases in S. Reinach's *Epigraphie*, p. 44.

[3] Tacitus, *Ann.*, iv, 43. Cf. the other evidence cited by Hertzberg (Vol. II, pp. 631 *sq.*). Since his book appeared there have been found eight coins of Thuria in that district marked ΛΑ[ΚΕΔΑΙΜ], which indicate that the dispute was not even then over (in Trajan's

A very similar case between Delphi, on the one hand, and Amphissa and Anticyra, on the other, only went back some 250 years to the settlement of M. Acilius Glabrio in 191 B. C., and was decided, after careful examination of the boundaries, by a legate of Claudius.[1]

The whole impression produced by the life of Greece during the first two generations of this century is so curiously empty and vapid—idyllic is Hertzberg's strange epithet—that I can cite as a parallel in our modern Europe only the monks of Mount Athos, whom I found living the same sort of existence—attending with care and ceremony to feasts and fasts, maintaining with rigid conservatism the old traditions of their religion, but lost to all newer and more living interests; employed in perpetual litigation about their boundaries, waiting anxiously in their retirement for some new thing as a subject of gossip; agreeable, hospitable, dignified, trivial—a fossil society feeding upon its traditions, petrified beyond the hope of renovation or healthy growth. Indeed, if I had not seen and studied this now unique society, I should feel wholly at a loss to comprehend the picture of Greece which the many inscriptions and few authors of the period of Augustus have disclosed to us.

It is hard to blame the policy of the emperors for this melancholy senility, though we may safely say that the enactments of Augustus were well adapted to maintain it;

---

time), but had recently been again settled by reverting to the decision of Augustus in favour of Sparta, to which Pausanias (in the second century) refers—so interminable was this dispute. Cf. the article by Weil in *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VII, pp. 211 *sq.*, who also cites a dispute at Delphi settled in the same reign by Nigrinus (*CIL.*, III, No. 567).

[1] Hertzberg, Vol. II, p. 44, and *CIG.*, No. 1711.

they were the enactments of a narrow and pedantic mind, unable to think out any large or serious remedy for the national decay, and yet, from a certain traditional respect for Greece, anxious to do what was possible to amuse and satisfy the Greeks. The tyrannical establishment of Nicopolis to commemorate his victory, with its Actian games,[1] its amphictyony, its many privileges, was clearly an imitation of the old Hellenistic fashion set by Alexander, whom Augustus probably considered his only rival in fame. The neighbouring Ætolia, Thessaly, and Acarnania were depopulated for this purpose, and their old *κοινά* abolished, just as Tigranes depopulated tracts of Asia Minor to fill his new capital Tigranocerta.[2] For a generation or two this mushroom foundation outshone Athens, Argos, and the other venerable seats of Greek culture, and was rivalled only by the Roman Corinth and the hardly less Roman Patræ. The assembly or conclave of cities which met at Argos, and passed shadowy resolutions and complimentary decrees, did perhaps less harm, but no good. We cannot even imagine any serious Greeks satisfied with such a mockery of old republican institutions.

For Augustus, though well instructed, like Julius Cæsar, in Greek letters, and though he interlarded his epistles and his talk with Greek phrases,[3] perhaps in imitation of Cicero, was, like Cæsar, a thorough Roman, who used the Greeks for his service and his amusements, but never dreamt of them as his social equals.[1]

---

[1] The temple of Apollo at Actium had been the old sanctuary of the *κοινόν* of Acarnania.

[2] Above, p. 119, and *BCH.*, X, p. 166.

[3] Cf. the specimens quoted by Suetonius (*Tiberius*, 21; *Claudius*, 4), and the general account of his Greek education in *Octavianus*, 89. "Ne Græcarum quidem disciplinarum leviore studio tenebatur. In quibus et ipsis præstabat largiter, magistro dicendi usus Apollodoro Pergameno, quem jam grandem natu Apolloniam quoque secum ab urbe juvenis ad hoc eduxerat, deinde eruditione

The same is true of Tiberius, whose very pedantic purism in rejecting every Greek word throughout all the solemn records of the Roman state shows clearly how inferior he thought his Greek associates. I do not think we need be misled in either case by such distinct *outings* in the life of each as the assumption of Greek habits by Augustus at Puteoli and Naples, in return for the compliments of Alexandrian sailors, or the life of Tiberius at Rhodes, which became more decidedly Greek the more he wished to avoid the notice and the jealousy of Augustus.[2] It is hard to say anything certain about Caligula's notions, seeing that he was little better than a raving lunatic. But he seems to have felt that the worship of his own

---

etiam varia repletus per Arei philosophi filiorumque ejus Dionysi et Nicanoris contubernium; non tamen ut aut loqueretur expedite aut componere aliquid auderet, nam si quid res exigeret, Latine formabat vertendumque alii dabat."

This last was the received practice of the Roman Senate, in their decrees concerning the Greek world, as I explained above.

[1] I do not feel that this remark needs qualification from the story of Plutarch (*Reip. gub. præc.*, 18), that he entered Alexandria holding the philosopher Areus by the hand, and telling the people that he spared the city for this his friend's sake. Nor do I lay the same stress that the Germans do upon the mission of Crinagoras, the Mytilenæan, and its success owing to this man's intimacy with the imperial household, for he was probably the Greek tutor of Marcellus, and apparently a person of consequence at home, perhaps because of this very position. Cf. Cichorius' tract, *Rom und Mytilene*, and Rubensohn's edition of the *Epigrams of Crinagoras*.

[2] Suetonius says (*Octavianus*, 98) of Augustus: "Lege proposita, ut Romani Græco, Græci Romano habitu et sermone uterentur," and that he spent days with the ephebi of Capreæ. This passage by itself would assimilate Augustus, as a Hellenist, with Claudius and lead to serious mistakes. So also *Tiberius*, 11, 12, on Tiberius' life at Rhodes. When in great fear of Augustus' displeasure, "redegit se, deposito patrio habitu, ad pallium et crepidas."

divinity and other ceremonies were better performed by Greeks, and so imported from the province of Asia choristers for this purpose.[1]

But after the dreadful interlude of Caligula's insanity we arrive with Claudius at quite a different condition of things. Claudius had lived most of his life in a private station, and was occupied, like every private gentleman of education at Rome, with Greek letters. He was too old to change his habits on the throne, and sat there as a literary, and therefore as the first Hellenistic, emperor. The favours he heaped upon Greece itself, the public use he made of Greek in the Senate house, the elevation of his Greek freedmen to the position of state ministers and privy councillors, speak plainly of this change; and if we remember how the fashion of the Roman court dominated the world, we shall date from this reign the first symptoms of recovery in Greece, the first steps towards that new and real fusion of Greek and Roman life which culminated in the removal of the seat of government from Rome to Byzantium.

The Hellenism of Claudius was carried still further by Nero, whose hideous crimes and follies have almost all this foreign stamp about them. His exhibitions were Greek, his Neronia *more Græco;*[2] his expedition to the Olympian and other games, his plundering of art treasures, every vagary and outrage of his almost incredible life, had this aspect. I think, therefore, the story told by Apollonius of Tyana,[3] that in his day he found a Roman governor at Corinth who knew no Greek and could not be understood by the people, so that his council sold justice and did what they liked, is either false or must be referred to some other reign. The pompous declaration of the freedom of all the Greeks at the Isthmian games of 67 A. D. seems to have been purely mischievous. The actual text has recently been discovered on an inscription at Acræphiæ in Bœotia, and published by M. Holleaux in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* for 1888. I here translate this curious text.

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiq. Iud.*, xix, 1. 14.

[2] Cf. the account in Tacitus, *Ann.*, xiv, 14 *sq.;* Suetonius, *Nero*, 23.

[3] In Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.*, v, 36.

The emperor Cæsar says:

Desiring to requite the most noble Hellas for her good-will towards me, and her piety, I invite as many as possible from this province to be present at Corinth the fourth day before the Calends of December.

When the multitude assembled in the *ecclesia*, he addressed them as follows:

With an unexpected gift, men of Hellas, do I favour you, even though nothing be surprising from my generosity—a gift such as ye would not even ask. Do ye now, all Greeks who inhabit Achæa and what was hitherto called Peloponnesus, receive liberty free of all tribute—a thing which not even in your most prosperous days did all of you enjoy, for ye were slaves either to foreigners or to one another. Would that I might have granted this gift when Hellas was in her strength, in order that many more might enjoy my favour; wherefore I owe Time a grudge, as it has forestalled me in taking from the greatness of this boon. But now, not through pity, but through good-will, do I benefit you, and requite your gods, whose good providence I have experienced both by land and sea, in that they vouchsafed me to do so great a good work. For other rulers have freed cities: Nero has freed a whole province.[1]

---

[1] Then follows an honorary decree, proposed by Epaminondas, to whom we shall presently revert. The text is quite complete, save

This harangue speaks plainly enough the vanity and folly of its author. There are traces, in the scanty evidence which remains, that local feuds and violences broke out immediately upon the recovery of this autonomy. Moreover, it fostered even in respectable Greeks false hopes, and when the prudent Vespasian interfered, and restored the order which was necessary to honest administration, he caused unreasonable discontent. The ostentatious clemency of Nero did not prevent his ruthlessly invading the sacred *Altis* of Olympia by building a palace for himself and a new entrance to the enclosure, as has been shown by recent excavations.[1]

I repeat, then, that Hellenistic fashions, maintained by two successive despots of the world and lasting for a whole generation—nearly thirty years—moulded all the courtiers, all the officials, all the soldiers who sought high place, into the once despised culture. Even the rude Sabine Vespasian, who had been obliged to accompany Nero to his performances, and had not been able to conceal his ennui, yet betrayed by his recreations, when an emperor, that he had studied Greek in a manner new and strange for a bluff Roman soldier, and his sons were distinctly of the Neronian, not of the older Roman, type.

---

that the name of Nero has been carefully hammered out in all but two places on the stone (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 510 *sq.*, and Appendix A for the Greek text).

[1] Cf. Dörpfeld in *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. XIII, p. 331. We know not how many precious archaic monuments may have been sacrificed to this vulgar ambition. Thus, not to speak of the statue of M. V. Agrippa set up on a huge pedestal which still survives in front of the *Propylæa* of Athens, a similar pedestal for a statue of King Prusias of Bithynia was tolerated in front of the great temple in the very heart of Delphi, and the largest votive offering there was that of Æmilius Paullus for his victory of Pydna.

I say this of Vespasian's recreations, for his serious measures were of a different kind: first, his abolishing the so-called liberties of all the Greek lands round the Levant, and reducing them to provinces;[1] secondly, his governmental endowment of professors.[2]

The Capitoline games established by Domitian show plainly how this ruler conceived the relation of Rome to Greek culture. For the whole account of Suetonius shows us the Greek complexion of the feast. It was threefold —*musicum*, *equestre*, *gymnicum*. There were prose (recitation) contests in Greek and Latin; there were *chorocitharistæ* and *psilocitharistæ*. He presided in thoroughly Greek dress—*crepidatus*, *purpureaque amictus toga Græcanica*. I quote this passage because the historian afterwards[3] says that he neglected higher studies at the opening of his reign, except that he repaired very carefully the loss of Roman libraries by fire; for he sent to Alexandria and had new copies of the lost books supplied.

This brief review justifies what I said above, that the first generation of this century was the lowest moment for Greece, the moment at which it was most neglected and despised, and that with Claudius began the period of its revival, which culminated with Hadrian. Even

---

[1] Suetonius, *Vespasian*, 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, 18: "primus e fisco Latinis Græcisque rhetoribus annua centena constituit; præstantes poetas, nec non artifices insigni congiario magnaque mercede donavit." On his amusements, *ibid.*, 23: "utebatur versibus Græcis tempestive satis," with specimens which justify Suetonius' previous remark: "erat enim dicacitatis plurimæ, et sic scurrilis et sordidæ, ut ne prætextatis quidem verbis abstineret."

[3] *Domitianus*, 4. 20.

Trajan, who spent his life in wars, affected or felt such an admiration for the Greek Dion that he took the rhetor publicly about in his chariot, though he naïvely declared that he could not understand one word of Dion's talk on philosophy.

But, as I have already said, we are strangely ill-supplied with Greek authors of this time, while at its close Dion, Plutarch, and in Latin Apuleius, spring up to tell us many things about the social and intellectual condition of Greek-speaking people. Still the seeds were germinating which produced the phil-Hellenism of Hadrian. Not that there were wanting rich and powerful men in Greece. We hear of the Spartan Eurycles, the intimate of Herod, and, like him, a sort of dynast bequeathing his power, who was even connected with some of the direst tragedies in that tyrant's life. For if we are to credit Joephus,[1] it was Eurycles who fomented the suspicions of Herod against his sons and caused their execution. At home he was not only rich and powerful, but owned the island of Cythera, and spent large sums on public buildings, and on the establishment of games at Sparta.[2] We

[1] *Antiq. Iud.*, xvi, 10. 1.

[2] *CIG.*, 1378, mentions games called *Eurycleia* in Sparta, and speaks of their profits to the city (cf. Hertzberg, Vol. I, p. 523), while the son of this Eurycles is the subject of an honorary decree (Ditt., *Syll.*, 359–63). As these *Eurycleia* are coupled with "the great Cæsarian games" at Sparta, and as another inscription (at Mistra, *CIG.*, 1299) tells us of *Agrippeastæ*, a guild in honour of Agrippa, we may conclude this Eurycles to have been a friend of the Romans, and popular with them like Herod. Cf. the article on Eurycles and his son, J. Cæsar Lacon, by R. Weil, in *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VI, pp. 11 *sq.* It is here shown that Eurycles was a far more important man than Josephus would lead us to suspect. The author even calls Josephus' account a caricature. Eurycles was the man who pursued Antony so ostentatiously after the battle of Actium (Plutarch, *Antonius*, 67). His public buildings are mentioned by Pausanias (ii, 3. 5; iii,

hear also of a new Epaminondas, whose benefactions to his country were very different from those of his great namesake, but not, I fear, the less suited to the times in which he lived. He is lauded in extant inscriptions for having represented Bœotia in the embassy of congratulation to Caligula (37 A. D.), and also for defraying all the expenses of a great festival at Ptoon, at which he provided feasting for the Bœotian public, in addition to prizes for artists and athletes.[1]

Such texts occur in every collection; they are found upon every site, and force upon us two questions: First, how is it that the Greeks seem never tired, not only of attending the existing festivals, but of establishing new contests? There appears to have been quite a traffic in embassies going from one city to another, inviting each κοινόν to acknowledge a new or newly organised festival in various formal ways. These often included the recognition of the right of asylum at the temple where the festival was to be held; always the formal mission of sacred commissioners to attend the feast; and the promise

---

14. 6). His *Eurycleia* and their cost are referred to in Wescher, *Inscriptions de Delphes*, p. 436. We hear of his having influence in Cappadocia also, so that this dynast reminds us in many ways of Herod, and his wide connections with the Hellenistic world.

[1] The details are given by Hertzberg (Vol. II, p. 64) from the long inscription in *CIG.*, 1625 (a more complete copy in *I. G. Sept.*, I, 2712), and from Keil's studies of Bœotian inscriptions (*Sylloge Inscr. Bœot.*, pp. 137 *sq.*). Other similar cases of belauding citizens for undertaking showy embassies to Rome, for establishing feasts, for squandering money in presents to the idle populace, are quite common (cf. *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 202, 203). Hertzberg notes that after the pompous laudations of Epamonidas for useless squandering, his reopening of the old tunnels to lower the Copiac Lake, a really useful public work, is hurried over with the briefest mention. He brought back from Caligula ἀπόκριμα πρὸς τὸ ἔθνος πάσης φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἐλπίδων ἀγαθῶν πλῆρες; cf. *I. G. Sept.*, 2711, l. 69.

to recognise and reward publicly such citizens as might win garlands at this feast.[1] Secondly, how is it that all the stones of the country seem hardly sufficient for the laudatory inscriptions which give formal thanks to citizens for their public benefactions, sometimes for the mere morality and general respectability of their life, sometimes even for no higher claim than their good manners? It seems worth while to suggest answers to both these questions, which are not asked, and certainly not answered, in the histories of the time.

There seem to be two reasons for the constant multiplication of festivals—for the Actia, Cæsaria, Neronia, Capitolina, which were added to the ancient list, and even for the repeating of the ancient games in other places than their original home.[2] Quite apart from the worship and flattery of the emperors, which were promoted in this way, it was, in the first place, the accredited occasion for ostentatious largesses from wealthy private citizens, and where there were many paupers, every additional occasion of the kind increased the chances of a dole. Secondly, it is important to call attention to a very neglected passage in Plutarch,[3] which tells us that the

---

[1] Cf. M. Paris in *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 334. A great collection of texts on such a subject are those now in Lord Dufferin's house at Clandeboye, published by Le Bas and Waddington in their Book III, pp. 64–85. It concerns the Dionysiac artists of Teos. Cf. also Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, Nos. 279, 280.

[2] Thus the people of Antioch sought for special leave to celebrate Olympic games at Daphne, and this leave must be obtained, and for a high price, from the people of Elis (cf. Hertzberg, Vol. II, p. 58, note). At present there are Olympic games, which I witnessed, celebrated every four years in the Panathenaic stadium at Athens—a curious revival.

[3] *De exilio*, 12: "For is it not permitted even for the banished (ἔξεστι δή που τῷ μεθεστῶτι) to spend his time at the mysteries of

Ovid was despatched, or Pantellaria, where there was no Hellenic celebration within reach. Nay, possibly the horrors of the Ægean islands were purposely magnified by the exiles to cloak this very privilege.

I pass to the second question proposed—the extraordinary frequency of complimentary decrees. We stand before a decayed society of very rich men and paupers, the latter of whom had become accustomed to begging, and to receiving subventions from the rich, not given in exchange for labour, but to obviate hostility and to earn acclamation. Thus we find all the recorded uses of large fortunes during the period to be of this ostentatious and well-nigh immoral character. There is no attempt to start a new industry, to develop a new traffic, to enable the poor to help themselves by honest labour. The unfortunate precedent set to the world by Rome was, indeed, of fatal influence. There it had long been the custom to give huge presents to the city mob, in the way of food and amusements, formerly to secure their votes, now to secure their acquiescence; and the same policy had been extended to the Household Troops (Prætorian Guards). This was the pattern imitated by the capitalists of Greece—the crime of distributing money to idle recipients, who had votes in their local assemblies, but could offer no return but acclamations, and pompous decrees engraved on marble. We have no evidence left us how the ordinary resentment of this idle and outspoken populace was manifested; but if I understand the temper of the times, the mere non-attainment of a decree of gratitude may have meant to the rich man that he would be scowled at or hooted when he went abroad, that he would be maligned at headquarters,[1] and put in danger of confiscation by emperors seeking for any excuse to replenish their treasury. These decrees, then, formal and foolish as they appear, may have been a sort of title to hold wealth in security and without constant molestation. Such are the considerations which explain to me the fantastic phenomena merely noticed by all the historians of later Greece.

I need hardly add that this habit, in a country where all the capital is in a few hands, where labour emigrates, and where the circulation consists in occasional lavishing of large sums upon a populace which has not earned them, is fatal, not only to all material prosperity, but to the moral dignity of the people. We know in our own day nations whose poverty and discontent arise from idleness, from the massing of wealth in the hands of a small minority, and from the extinction of a healthy middle class of farmers and traders. There, too, we hear the cry, if not yet for confiscations, at least for remissions of just debts, for royal residences, for those exhibitions which are the modern analogne of the Greek festivals, for any occasional and transitory novelty "which will bring money into the country," as the phrase goes. There, too, sudden plenty, the possibility of earning large wages for slight duties, the pleasure of an exciting stir, are regarded as if they were the return of real prosperity to an idle or decaying society. It is the old story of applying stimulants to revive depression, and mistaking the excitement produced for the vigour of returning health.

---

[1] I shall quote in a subsequent chapter Dion's account of the treatment he received from his fellow-citizens, from which the reader will see how far my inferences are justified (cf. also below, p. 358).

The economists, from Finlay onward, who have speculated upon the financial life of the Roman Empire, and its passage from apparent opulence to universal penury or bankruptcy, have noticed as an active cause the great waste of precious metals in furniture and ornaments, as well as their constant exportation to the far East in payment for luxuries such as jewels, unguents, etc., without any parallel production in Europe to induce a return of gold for European industry.[1] Silver, especially, became scarcer and scarcer, so that the reckless Nero had recourse to a debasement of the coinage to relieve his difficulties. This diminution in the circulation of precious metals had a depressing influence on trade, and still more on the condition of the poorer classes. Debt and insolvency became very frequent in Greece, and the Roman usurers who profited by these misfortunes no longer kept large and well-farmed estates, as Pomponius Atticus had done, in Greece. The lands of the Greek capitalists, as has been already observed, were in pasture and managed by a few slaves. Mining, once so productive in Macedonia and Greece, had first been discouraged by the Romans, and now, when their jealousy was allayed, seems not to have been capable of revival. At least we hear that the silver mines of Laurium were exhausted, which we now know was false, and not a word transpires concerning the once prolific gold mines of Mount Pangæus, Siphnos, and Thasos. The precious marble quarries near Carystos in Eubœa were imperial property, and so were probably most of those on the islands. In any case, such work required large capital both in slaves and in ships.

---

[1] Cf. Mr. Vincent Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 337, for the quantity of Roman gold coins found at Cannanore.

The only special manufacture still thoroughly alive in Greece was the manufacture of education, and even in this matter Athens, formerly the capital of universities, and again destined to be so in later days, was now obscured by Rhodes, Alexandria, and Tarsus. We may therefore be sure that most of the ability in Greece migrated to Italy, where the house stewards, the secretaries, the schoolmasters, the musicians, the painters, the actors, the dancers, were Greek, and more probably Greeks of the depressed Hellas than of the prosperous Asia Minor or its islands.

I regard the proclamation of the liberty of Greece by Nero as a mere piece of mischievous fooling. Though Philostratus represents the sage Apollonius as indignant at the sensible Vespasian for withdrawing this liberty, we can find no revival of any good thing while it lasted. If the people were relieved from taxes, they probably injured themselves to more than the amount by passing extravagant measures in their assemblies, and making property insecure by attacks upon the rich. The needy seem to have felt some advantage from it, probably that of voting away other people's money; the strange phenomenon of false Neros arising after his ill-certified death, and drawing multitudes after them, cannot otherwise be explained.

These days of Nero are synchronous with the visits of St. Paul. It is, indeed, almost wholly from the visits of distinguished strangers that we must draw our pictures, until we reach the gentle and patriotic Plutarch. If the history of Apollonius of Tyana had been put together in a sober and critical spirit by Philostratus, we should have had another source of insight into the Greek world of no small importance; but this long and curious book is so evidently a mere fairy-tale, composed for the purpose of painting an ideal sage and wonder-worker of the neo-Pythagorean school, that all recent critics have justly rejected it as a source for history. It appears to me a counterpart, not of the life of Christ, as Baur and Zeller maintain, but of the fabulous history of Alexander the Great, which I have elsewhere discussed, and it sets up a moral and religious conqueror of the world in contrast to the king and the man-of-arms.

But let us now turn to St. Paul, whose visits to Greece, quite apart from their theological side, will afford us at least one trustworthy and independent picture of the state of things in the cities which he visited. And as we are not concerned with the dogmatic side, so also we need not trouble ourselves concerning the exact years of his visits. His work was certainly under the reign of Nero, and to all appearance before the artistic visit of that eccentric personage had set all Greece into a ferment with its silly benevolences and its serious injustices.

The first entry of the apostle was into Macedonia, where three cities—Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa—were the scenes of his labours. Those who have followed with me the total ruin of Macedonia by the Roman conquest will be somewhat surprised when they reflect that St. Paul found at least three flourishing towns in that country. But all these towns were practically new foundations. Thessalonica, formerly Therma, from which the Thermaic Gulf received its name, had been *synœkised* by Casander from the surrounding villages into a Hellenistic town, which attained importance from its mercantile position when Macedonia had been ruined, and so was important enough to be declared a "free city" when its inhabitants had fortunately sided with Octavian and Antony in the campaign of Philippi.

To mark the site of the great victory at this latter place, a Roman colony was established; hence we find St. Paul, on his first arrival in Europe, visiting in succession a town of Roman complexion, and one of the prevalent Hellenistic type, not assimilated to Italian ideas in its internal economy. The commentators on St. Paul's life[1] have shown many interesting differences between these two places, implied by the author of the *Acts* incidentally through his narrative. At Philippi the apostle was charged with preaching a new religion not authorised, and therefore illegal, to Roman citizens. He is brought by lictors before prætors, scourged with rods, and finally turns the tables upon his persecutors by claiming to be a Roman citizen, and complaining to have been beaten and condemned without trial, contrary to the established privileges of that favoured class. When he comes to Thessalonica, he has to contend with an assembly of Greek people and their elected magistrates, whom the writer calls by a curious name, *politarchs*, since verified by an inscription found on the Roman archway at Salonica.[2]

But the common feature in these widely contrasted societies was the presence of a large number of Jews, who naturally, since their wholesale importation by Antiochus the Great to the coast of Asia Minor,[3] had got much of the Levantine trade into their hands, and would of course seize the opportunity of settling in any new foundation made by the Romans. It is plain that the Jewish population was always the first object of the apostle's care; nor do we know of his founding a successful church among pure Greeks, such as the people of Athens and Sparta. It was always among the mixed populations—and wherever they were mixed there were plenty of Jews—that he found the proper soil for sowing his spiritual seed. It is this close combination of cosmopolitan Judaism with cosmopolitan Hellenism which afforded the new religion its non-local, non-parochial hot-beds, and fitted it (humanly speaking) for the acceptance of the world.

---

[1] E. g., Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Travels of St. Paul*, Vol. I, p. 357, of the quarto edition.

[2] The two narratives are in *Acts*, xvi and xxii, and with them cf. the chapters (i, ix) in Conybeare and Howson's excellent book.

[3] *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 487.

But while this was doubtless the general character of all these new cities, we can see in the apostle's preaching and his persecutions a varying complexion. While, as I have said, at the Roman Philippi he is charged with contravening the Roman ordinances about religion, the charge against him at Thessalonica is that he joins with those who are not Cæsar's friends; and this, together with his emphatic proclamation of the coming kingdom of Christ as spiritual, and not necessarily as proximate, shows that he knew the hope of many Thessalonians for some new kingdom better and milder than the Roman dominion; perhaps even traditions and memories of the old Macedonian glories were still alive, as well as the fresher recollections of the cruel devastations of the Roman conquest. Berœa seems to have gathered into one what remained both of Pella and Ægæ, which were now nothing but miserable ruins. This town was some way from the sea, yet the trade of supplying the inland mountaineers was sufficient to induce Jews to settle there also.

From these Macedonian cities St. Paul came directly by sea to the far less congenial Athens, where there were, indeed, some Jews settled, as we know from sepulchral inscriptions,[1] but where the traditions and interests of the old religions were too strong to admit of inroads from newer and deeper faiths. The philosophers were, indeed, ready to hear any new thing, but the temples and images of the gods, which attracted as many visitors as the schools, were still precious to the people, and made Athens the stronghold of paganism long after all real faith in the Greek gods had passed away. All this was consistent with plenty of scepticism in the educated classes, and with many superstitions not strictly Hellenic among the people. The fact that about this time three writers within a century mention altars to the unknown (or unknowable) gods seems to show that this worship was in some respects novel, and though we are at first disposed to set it down as a peculiar form of homage to Demeter and Cora, there may really have been some feeling, such as that suggested by the narrative of the *Acts*, that the anger of some neglected deity could be appeased by anonymous sacrifice. But I am not here going to discuss these points, which have been appropriated by theologians. There are controversies enough in the field before us without turning aside to join in the undying strife over New Testament history.

Passing on then from Athens, about which the *Acts* tell us nothing which we could not take or infer from other sources, we come to Corinth, where the apostle spent much time and laboured with great success. Indeed, his second espistle is addressed, not only to the Corinthians, but to the saints throughout the whole of Achaia—a term then including northern Greece as well as Peloponnesus. But, most unfortunately for us, he does not seem to have visited the other two places, where there was a mixed population of Jews, Greeks, and Romans, such as those known to us through his letters. These remaining towns were Patræ and Nicopolis—each owing its present prosperity to Roman favour, each in the rank of colonies, and Patræ, moreover, a great trading place like Corinth.

---

[1] *CIA.*, III, 3547, and *CIG.*, IV, pp. 585 *sq.*, where Jewish inscriptions from Athens, Ægina, etc., are quoted.

I do not think we are warranted in describing all the splendour of Corinth detailed in Philostratus, Lucian, and Aristides as belonging to this period, though this course has been adopted by Hertzberg;[1] for we may be certain that, after the earthquake in Vespasian's time (about 76 A. D.), his and other emperors' benevolences made the restored town much more magnificent than the old foundation of Julius Cæsar had been. All the descriptions to which I refer date from the days after Hadrian's astonishing display of architecture and engineering over the world. But without doubt Corinth was even in St. Paul's day, and before the visit of Nero, a thriving and beautiful city, less Greek, however, excepting Nicopolis and Patræ, than any other town in the peninsula, and no doubt the most cosmopolitan of all. People from all parts of the world came there; the costumes and the tongues of all nations might be found in its streets. Here, if anywhere, the miraculous gift of tongues, had it been intended for missionary purposes, would have found ample scope for its exercise.[1] Nero's folly and ostentation prompted him to undertake the cutting of the isthmus—a project accomplished a few years ago, after long delay from want of funds.[2] When Nero undertook this work, and all manner of people were pressed in to help in the digging, there must have been a moment of strange activity in this thoroughfare.[3] We are told that at Corinth also, in accordance with its Roman character, gladiatorial combats, repugnant to the good taste and humanity of the Greeks, were first introduced, and Dion notices with horror and disgust that these barbarities had from thence penetrated to Athens, where a stone balustrade round the orchestra (pit) of the theatre of Dionysus shows too plainly the bloody nature of the exhibitions to which that splendid palace of art was degraded.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 239 *sq.*

> But now there is nothing which happens there [in Greece] at which any man would not feel ashamed. To give an obvious example, as regards gladiatorial combats, the Athenians have been so anxious to rival the Corinthians, or rather have so far exceeded both them and others in degradation, that while the Corinthians witness these exhibitions outside their town in a ravine able to contain a crowd, but otherwise so rough and neglected that no one would even bury a free man in it, the Athenians witness this delightful spectacle under the very Acropolis, where they have set Dionysus over the orchestra, so that

---

[1] It is very remarkable that it is to this very church that St. Paul writes in a manner precluding altogether the common supposition that this gift enabled men to preach in foreign languages to the nations of the world. Cf. *First Corinth.*, chap. xvi.

[2] The project is now, or ought to be, antiquated. Steamers can double Cape Malea without danger or delay, and the railway from Patras to Athens has forestalled any large passenger traffic.

[3] Philostratus (*Vita Apoll.*, v, 19), whatever his authority is worth, says that the philosopher Musonius was forced to labour, and tells anecdotes how both he and Apollonius "improved the occasion."

> often a man is butchered among the very marble seats, where the hierophant and other priests have their seats.[1]

Perhaps the extant balustrade is later in date than Dion's speech, and was suggested by it. Let me add a pathetic touch from Plutarch:

> I notice among gladiators, if they be not utter barbarians, but Greeks, that when the hour of the show approaches, and a splendid meal is set before them, they prefer to settle their affairs, to commit their wives to trusty friends, and free their personal attendants.[2]

The wilder races evidently went into the arena after a reckless feast. There is evidence of "amphitheatre sports" in many other parts of Greece, and in some actually of gladiatorial combats; but I do not think all the instances collected by the learned are trustworthy, and am inclined to think that this non-Hellenic pastime was adopted only in special imitation of the Romans, and where either many Romans or many ostentatious philo-Romans had their homes.[3] The only actual traces of an amphitheatre are said to be at Corinth, and even there they appeared to me so faint as to be very doubtful.

We must not wonder at what may be called this illogical sentimentalism on the part of people who systematically approved of torture in judicial proceedings, and who, moreover, for the last three centuries had been accustomed to the semi-oriental punishments inflicted by Hellenistic kings. Such inconsistencies are common in all societies, and the line drawn between the tolerable and the intolerable in public taste can be determined by no logical reason, but rather by the weight and force of a number of conflicting traditions, which together make up that curiously inconsistent thing—national character. In no case known to me is the composition of this character so complex, and therefore so difficult to estimate, as in the case of the Hellenistic Greeks. I can give no better example than to turn to the simple and old-fashioned life of the period, as described in the works of Dion.

---

[1] Dion., i, 385.

[2] *Non posse suaviter*, etc., 17.

[3] Cf. Hertzberg, Vol. II, p. 253, note; Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, Vol. II, pp. 383 *sq.* The latter thinks it was only the dregs of the people who liked these cruelties, because Plutarch, Demonax, Lucian, etc., condemn them as barbarous in every sense. He forgets that Romans as good as Trajan and Hadrian openly favoured them, and that probably the remaining wealthy people in Greece were far more likely to be led by the fashion of the Roman court than the philosophy of the Chæronean sage.

The first is a picture he gives[1] of life at Borysthenes, a Greek settlement at the mouth of the Dnieper on the north coast of the Euxine, whose inhabitants had long been severed from their mother-country, and surrounded with Scythian barbarians far more intractable to civilisation than Parthians or even Celts. The introduction to this speech, which is really an essay on monarchy, as suggested by monotheism, or monarchy among the gods, is like the scenery of the oration *on Poverty*, which we shall presently discuss; and therefore I cannot but suspect the former, as I suspect the latter, of being mere dramatic invention. Thus in discussing with the Borysthenites the Platonic view that the rule of one man is best, he never once alludes to the fact that the "Bosporan kingdom," which included the Crimea and the Greek marts on either side of it, had now been for a long time under the control of *kings*—the last kings tolerated within the Roman sway, a nominal kingdom till the reign of Constantine. In Dion's time Pliny mentions a messenger from King Sauromates coming to Nicæa.[1] If it be, indeed, true that the town of Olbia (the other name for Borysthenes) was left independent, it would be still more odd that he should discuss with a "free people" the propriety of monarchy without the smallest allusion to the practical bearing of the question. As, however, he repeats in his *Olympica* that he had visited this outlying region from curiosity, I think we may, in this case, doubtfully accept the Sophist's picture as historical.

---

[1] *Oration* xxxvi.

He begins with a very graphic description of the city lying on a tongue of land where the great rivers Borysthenes and Tanais meet, and thence continue their course to the sea over vast shallows studded with lofty reeds, which appear like a forest of masts to approaching mariners. Here was the great factory for preparing salt, which supplied all the barbarians of the interior. The city itself he found greatly shrunken away by successive stormings of the surrounding barbarians, with whom it had been for centuries at war—the last great reverse being the conquest by the Getæ of the whole coast as far as Apollonia about 120 B. C. From this the Greek cities had never recovered, some being wholly deserted, others rebuilt on a small scale, and obliged to admit barbarians as occupiers.[2] Borysthenes, however, was settled again, to serve as a mart for the Scythians with the Greeks, who would otherwise have abandoned altogether any attempt to deal with the barbarians. Yet even in its restored state the houses were mean and the area of the city contracted. It was attached, so to speak, to part of the old circuit wall, with a few towers remaining of the old size and strength. The new wall, which joins the arc of the old circuit, is low and weak, and the area within only partially occupied by houses. There are solitary towers still standing out in the country far apart from the present town.[1] Another sign of its old disaster is that not a single statue in the shrines is intact, but all are mutilated, as are also those on the other monuments of the city.

---

[1] Epist. 63, *ad Trai.*, with Mr. Hardy's note.

[2] This statement is now corroborated by an inscription of Odessus (Varna), giving a list of priests who had officiated, μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, after the return of the Greeks to their devastated town (cf. *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. XI, p. 201). It is remarkable that he says not a word about the remarkable recovery of Greek cities effected after that time by the campaigns of Diophantus, Mithradates' general. Cf. above, p. 116.

Such was the town which Dion was observing with interest on a summer forenoon from the suburb along the river. Some of the townsmen join him, and there comes up on horseback a fine young man, who dismounts and gives his horse to an attendant. Under his short, light, black Greek cloak (black in imitation of the Scythians) he has a huge sword and trousers, and, in fact, Scythian dress. This Callistratus was reputed equally formidable in battle and zealous in philosophy. Indeed, the whole population is so devoted to Homer and to the worship of his Achilles (whose temple is on a neighbouring island) that, though they talk very bad and barbarised Greek, most of them know Homer off by heart; a few go so far as to study Plato.

Dion then quotes to them a saw of Phocylides, whose name they do not know, and makes some disparaging remark on Homer and his many details of Achilles' jumping and shouting, while the Gnomic poet gathers mu ethical wisdom into a couplet. They answer Dion that, but for their extreme respect and liking for him, no citizen of the place would have tolerated any aspersion upon the divine Achilles and the well-nigh divine Homer. But they are ready to hear what Dion has to say, even though they run some risk in discoursing with him outside the city. "For yesterday at noon the Scythians surprised our sentries, slaying some, and taking others alive, as we did not know which way they had fled, and could not help them, and even then the gates had been shut, and the war signal was flying from the walls." Yet so keen were they that they all came down armed to hear him. Dion then proposes not to discourse on the promenade, but to go inside the city, and they gather at the public place in front of the temple of Zeus—the magistrates and elders sitting round upon the stone seats, and the crowd standing behind them. The sight was delightful to a philosopher, to see these people dressed in antique fashion with long hair and beards, one of them only being cropped and shaven, much to their disgust and contempt. For he was supposed to be obsequious to the Romans, and to have adopted their fashion accordingly.[1]

---

[1] This curious sight may now be seen at the Messene of Epaminondas (cf. my *Rambles and Studies in Greece*, p. 391).

I need not go into Dion's discourse, which is most politely interrupted by one who tells him how scarce is a decent visitor in these parts. "For most of the Greeks who come are more barbarous than we are, traders and hucksters, bringing in worthless rags and bad wine, and getting nothing better in exchange." Starting from a query about Plato, Dion then defends an intelligent monarchy.

---

[1] Trajan's wars were causing alarm; cf. Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.*, V, 311.

Let us now turn to a very different picture—that of primitive rural life in his seventh oration:[1]

> This I am going to narrate from my own experience, not from hearsay. For perhaps loquacity and the difficulty of dropping a subject are not only features of old age; they may also be the characteristics bred by a roving life, probably because in each case there are many experiences which men recall with pleasure. I am now going to tell what men and manners I stumbled upon, I may say, in the midst of Hellas.
>
> I happened to be crossing from Chios with some fishermen in a very little boat, not in the summer season. A great storm rose, and with difficulty we escaped into the "hollows of Eubœa." There they smashed the boat, running her ashore on a rough shingle beach under the cliffs, and went off to some purple-shell fishers at anchor inside the nearest claw of land, intending to work with them and remain there. So I was left behind alone, with no place of refuge, and I was wandering at random along the shore, on chance of meeting some ship at anchor or sailing by. After a long walk, during which I did not meet a soul, I came upon a buck which had just fallen from the cliff down to the very edge of the water, still gasping as it was being touched by the waves. And presently I thought I heard the baying of dogs far above me, indistinct by reason of the roar of the sea. Proceeding therefore, and climbing up with great difficulty to the height above me, I found the dogs beating about, which I concluded had forced the game to spring over the cliff, and presently I came upon a man, whose look and dress implied a hunter, of healthy complexion, wearing his hair long behind in no unmanly fashion, but like the Eubœans whom Homer describes coming to Troy. And he hailed me: "Stranger, have you seen a buck coming this way?" To which I answered: "There he is, in the wash of the sea;" and I brought him down to his game. So he drew the buck back from the water, and skinned him with his knife, I helping as well as I could, and

---

[1] Entitled εὐβοικὸς ἢ κυνηγὸς, and even more properly περὶ πενίας, which is the serious subject of the oration.

then he took the haunches with the skin, and proceeded to carry them away. He invited me, too, to follow and eat a share of the venison, as his dwelling was not far off. "When you have rested the night with us, you can come back to the sea, since at present sailing is impossible; nor need you apprehend that there will be a change while you are resting, for I should be glad to think the storm would subside within the next five days, but it is not likely, so long as you see the mountain tops capped with clouds as they now are." He went on to ask whence I came, and how I got there, and whether my boat was not wrecked. "It was a very small one," I answered, "belonging to fishermen, who were crossing, and I, being pressed for time, was their only passenger; but we were wrecked upon the shore." "Very naturally—look how wild the coast is. This is what they call the 'hollows' of Eubœa, and a ship driven in here hardly ever gets out again. Even the crews are generally lost, unless they are in very light boats, like yours. But come with me, and don't fear. First get over your fatigues, and to-morrow we shall consult how we may send you on safe, as we have now made acquaintance with you. For you seem to me some city person, not a sailor or a mechanic, and to have worn out your body by some other kind of hardship than theirs." I, of course, went with him gladly, for I never was afraid of being robbed, having nothing with me but a shabby cloak—so hallowed and sacrosanct a thing have I found poverty, which men violate more rarely even than they would a herald with his insignia.

On the way he told me how he lived with his wife and children. "There are two of us living in the same place; we have married sisters, and both have sons and daughters. We live mostly by the chase, with the help of a little farming. For the land is not ours, but our fathers were poor and free like ourselves, earning their bread by herding cattle for one of the rich men of this island, who possessed many droves of horses and oxen, many flocks of sheep, many broad acres, and much other wealth; in fact, all the mountains you see around you. But when he died, and his property was confiscated—they say he was put to death by the emperor (βασιλεύς) for the sake of his wealth care, on account o For in winter we grazed the grass, and made hay. In the tains."

The orator proceeds to d situation of these hunters' running water, with fruitful from their stable, and fair And, as they had spare tim to hunting with their dogs; all driven away, two of the missing the herdsmen, turn to their accustomed home. herdsmen, and only graduall being originally mere watch-d

But when winter came on, o work, and they never went down they made their huts and courty able, and took into cultivation the hunting far easier in the winter. wet soil, and snow shows the gan clear as a high road.

So they

The other man [his cousin] has never been to the city, though now fifty years old, but I twice only—once with my father when we kept the great man's herds, and again when a man came asking us for money, as if we had any, and commanding us to follow him to the city. We swore we had none, for we would have given it to him at once, if we had. So we entertained him as best we could, and gave him two buckskins, and then I went with him to the city [probably Carystos, though Dion takes care to leave it so vague that Chalcis would suit as well]. For he said one of us must go and tell all about it. So I saw again many great houses and a strong wall around them, with square towers in it, and many ships lying in the harbour, as if in an inland lake. We have nothing like it here, where you landed; that is why the ships get lost. These things I saw, and a great crowd gathered together with much confusion and shouting, so that I thought there was a general fight going on.

The man then brought me to the magistrates, and said laughing: "This is the man you sent me for, but he owns nothing except his back hair and a hut of very strong sticks." Then the magistrates went to the theatre, and I along with them.

The hunter here describes the theatre, adding,

Perhaps you are laughing at me for telling you what you know quite well. For some time the mob was engaged at other things, at times shouting in good humour and applauding, at times the very reverse. This, their anger, was dangerous, and they terrified the men at whom they shouted, so that some went round supplicating, and some threw off their cloaks in dread, for the sound was like a sudden wave, or thunder. Indeed, I myself was almost knocked down by the shout. And various people got up to address the assembly from the midst of it, or from the stage; some with few words, others with many. Some they listened to for a long time, others they would not tolerate from the outset, or allow them to utter a syllable.

At last they put me forward also. And one spoke as follows: "This, gentlemen, is one of those who till the public land these many years, not only himself, but his father before him, and they graze our mountains, and farm and hunt and build them many houses, and plant vines, and have many comforts, neither paying any rent nor having a grant from this people. And why, indeed, should they? For holding our lands and becoming rich they never bear the expenses of any public service, or pay any tax on their profits, but live free and without burdens, as if they were public benefactors of our city. Indeed, I suppose they never came here before." Whereat I shook my head, and the crowd that saw me burst out laughing. Then the speaker got angry, and became abusive. "Well, then," he went on, "if you approve of this, why don't we all proceed to plunder the public property, whether money or land, if you allow these scoundrels to own for nothing more than one thousand plethra of land, which would give you three measures of wheat per man?" And I burst out laughing as loud as I could, but the mob no longer laughed, but hooted. Then the speaking man got angry, and, scowling at me, said: "Look at the dissembling and insolence of the brute — how he brazens it out and laughs, whom I can hardly refrain from having summarily executed along with his accomplice. For I understand that there are two of them, the ringleaders of the gang who have seized the whole mountain. Indeed, I think they are not innocent of wrecking what is driven upon their shore, living as they do near the promontory of Caphereus. How else could they have amassed such wealth in villages and cattle? Don't be misled by his coming here in rags like a beggar. Indeed, I shuddered as he seemed to me the traditional Nauplios of the myths coming from Caphereus. Like that person, I doubt not that he shows light from the cliffs in order to decoy ships upon the rocks." When all this and much more had been said, the crowd was much excited, and I was in suspense, fearing they would do me some harm.

Then there rose up another, a respectable man, to judge from his words and dress, and asked for a hearing. He argued that those who occupied and tilled idle land did no harm, but good, and that those only ought to be punished who do it harm; for see now, he added, "how two-thirds of our territory are deserted through neglect and want of population. I too possess many acres both in the uplands and in the plain, which if any man will till, I shall not only allow it gratis, but even pay him money to do it. For, of course, it will become more valuable to me, and waste land is not only useless, but a miserable and pitiful sight, showing some misfortune in its owners. You should therefore encourage every occupation of such public land, both by people of means and by the poor, in order that the country may be worked and the people better disposed, when your citizens escape from two crying evils—laziness and penury. Let any of them have it free for ten years, and then pay a small tax on their produce, not on their cattle. Let even a stranger have it for five years, and then pay a double tax. Whoever tills two hundred plethra, let him be made a citizen. Since now even the land without the gates is wild and horrid like a remote wilderness, and not the suburb of a city; and most of what is inside the walls is now in crops and grass. And yet these sycophants attack men who are working hard at our extremest bounds, while they say nothing about those who plough up the gymnasium and graze in the agora. Look yourselves, I pray you, at your gymnasium turned into a corn-field, so that Heracles and the other statues, even those of the gods, are hidden by the crops; the sheep of the last speaker graze every day in the agora round the old public offices, so that every stranger first derides and then pities this city."

At this the mob was very angry. "Yet he proposes to punish these poor men, so that no one else shall follow their example, but either turn brigands outside, or thieves within, the city. Let them off, I tell you, with a small tax for the future, or let them buy their land on cheaper terms than you would give it to others." Then followed an angry altercation. At last they told me to say what I chose. "About what?" said I. "In answer to the speeches," said one of those sitting by. [I must abridge the speech that here follows.] "I say then that my accuser told a pack of lies about broad acres and villages. We have nothing of the kind, and would that we had, for we should willingly give them to you, and ourselves be fortunate. But take anything we have, if you like, for we can procure other such." At this there was applause, and the magistrate asked me what we could give the people, and I said: "Four very fine buckskins." Then the crowd laughed, but the magistrate grew angry. "The bearskins," I proceeded, "are hard and goatskins not very good; but take them, if you wish." Then he told me I was an absolute boor (ἄγροικος). "Here you are," said I, "talking again of fields (ἄγρους), which we don't possess." But he asked me if each of us would give an Attic talent. To which I answered: "We do not weigh out our meat, but will give what we have, dry or salted" [he understands talent to mean a weight for meat].

The magistrate then questions him in detail about wheat, wine, etc., all of which he is ready to give, such as they have, if they will send a man with a vessel to hold them; and he gives a simple inventory of their rustic goods—eight she-goats, a cow and calf, four sickles, four spades, three spears and a knife each to fight the wild beasts, earthen pots, and a wife and children each. They are ready to give up all, provided they are not treated with violence, and are given an empty house in the city, where there are many. But, as it is, he suggests that they are innocent citizens, bringing up sons who will fight for the city better than the scolding politicians.

"But I had well-nigh forgotten," he adds, "the thing I ought to have said first of all. Which of you could believe us guilty of such shocking impiety as wrecking, especially on a coast where nothing comes ashore but splinters? Indeed, the baskets I once found on the shore I pinned up to the sacred oak by the sea. May I never, O Zeus, profit by the misfortune of others![1] But many a time have I pitied the shipwrecked, and brought them home, and escorted them safely out of the wilds. But as I don't know who they were, I cannot now cite them as witnesses. May none of you ever fall into such a plight as to do me this service."

---

[1] I fear the modern inhabitants of the wild coasts of Europe, even of Scotland and Ireland, entertain very different feelings. All of us know stories of wrecking, and Dr. Purser calls my attention to notes H and I appended to Scott's *Pirate*, as giving the attitude imputed by the demagogue to the innocent rustic.

Thereupon a man started up from the midst and exclaimed: "Long since I thought I recognised him, but was uncertain. But now that I know him, I should be an impious villain not to stand up and speak in his behalf. I, and this man beside me (who then stood up), are, as you know, citizens, and we happened to sail in the ship of Socles two years ago. We were wrecked at Caphereus, and most of us lost. We two made our way up the cliffs with great difficulty and well-nigh naked, hoping to find some shelter with a shepherd before we died of hunger and thirst. At last we came to some huts, and shouted to those within, whereupon this man came out and brought us in, and lit a fire, and he and his wife rubbed us with lard, for they had no oil, and bathed us with hot water. Then they fed us and gave us wine, and kept us for three days. And as we departed they gave each of us meat and a fine skin. And, seeing me still suffering, he took the tunic off his daughter and put it on me, and she had to wear some other rag. This I gave back to him when he had brought us as far as the village. Thus, under providence, do we own our safety to this man." Then I remembered them and said, "Hail Sotades," and went up and kissed both him and his friend, at which the crowd laughed loudly. So I discovered that in cities people don't kiss any more.[1]

Then his former defender got up and proposed that for these merits he should be asked to dine in the council house; he should get a new tunic and cloak, have his land free, and be given one hundred drachmæ to stock it, which the speaker offered to contribute himself. All this was

---

[1] So the contemporary Plutarch says (*Conjug. præcepta*, 13): "Cato expelled from the Senate a man who kissed his wife in presence of his daughter. This is perhaps going too far; but if it be shameful (αἰσχρόν), as it really is, to be embracing and kissing in the presence of others, how much worse is it to quarrel in their presence! All signs of affection to your wife should therefore be in secret," etc.

[illegible] go to dinner in a leath
invited to dine with the magistr
will do without dinner today."
me into the clothes, and I wanted
but they would not stand that. T
and said: "Give it to the politic
may bury it; for he plainly knows

Meanwhile Dion and his ho
and found about it a fair gard
vegetables.

There we proceeded to feast fo
upon leaves and skins on a raised
beside him. But a grown-up dau
brought us sweet red wine to drink.[1]

We pass by the reflections of th
simple but perfect happiness. B
scene, too charming and exceptio
ture to be here omitted:

When we had now well feasted,
with him his son, a comely youth, ca
as he came in, and, while his fathe
the girl and gave her the hare. Th
and sat down by her moth

grapes or vegetables. For they have no garden. Last year we got from them some wheat for seed, but gave it back after our reaping." "And are you going," said I "to give this girl to another rich man, that he too may lend you seed upon usury?" Whereupon I saw both the youth and the maiden blushing. "No," replied the father, "she will have a poor man, a hunter like ourselves;" and he looked kindly towards the youth. "Then why don't you get her married?" said I; "are you waiting for him to come from the village?" "Indeed, he is not far off, but here present, and we will have the marriage when we can find a suitable day." "What do you mean by that?" "When the moon is full," said he, "for the air must be pure and the sky clear." "Is he really a good sportsman?" said I. "Well," said the youth, "I can hunt down a deer, and stand up to a boar. You may come and see yourself, stranger, to-morrow, if you like." "Did you run down this hare?" "No," said he smiling; "I took it in a net by night, for the sky is beautifully clear and the moon bigger than I ever saw it." Then the two elder men laughed, and he was ashamed and silent.

Thereupon the girl's father said: "I am making no delay, but your father is waiting until he can go and buy a proper sacrifice. For we must offer our dues to the gods." Whereupon a young brother of the girl broke in: "But this boy has long since got his sacrifice ready, and it is being fattened to a fine size here behind the hut." And they asked the youth: "Is this so?" And he confessed it. "But where did you get it?" "When we came upon the wild sow with the young ones, all the rest escaped; indeed, they were fleeter than hares; but one I knocked over with a stone, and threw my jerkin over it; this I exchanged in the village for a porker, and kept it in a sty I made for it behind the other pig-sty." "So this," said his father, "is why your mother kept laughing when I noticed the noise of pigs, and this is how you used up the grain. Let us see it." So he and the children rushed out in high glee. Meanwhile the girl went out and brought from her store winter apples and fine grapes and other dainties, wiping the table with leaves, and putting fresh ferns under the fruit. Then they brought in the pig with great laughter and jokes. And there came in with them the mother of the youth and two of his little brothers, bringing white bread and boiled eggs and vegetables. She embraced her relations, and, sitting down by her husband, said: "This is the victim, which he has long been preparing for his marriage; and we have everything else we want, except perhaps a little wine, which we can easily get from the village." And her son stood behind her and watched our host, who said: "Perhaps he wants to wait till he fattens his pig." The lad answered that it was ready to burst with fat.

"Take care," said I, desirous to back him up, "that while your pig gets fat your boy doesn't get lean." "Indeed, the stranger is right," said his mother; "the boy has not been at all like himself; and I noticed him the other night sleepless and walking about outside the hut." "The dogs were barking," said he, "and I went out to see." "Not you," she answered; "but you were wandering about distraught. Let us not distress him any longer;" and she put her arms about the girl's mother. So the latter said to her husband: "Let it be as they desire." And they fixed the day after the morrow for the wedding, inviting me to wait for it. This I was delighted to do, reflecting at the time how different is the life of the rich in this as well as in all else, with their intermediaries, and their enquiries into property and family, with their dowries and presents and promises and deceits, with their bonds and settlements, and often, in the end, their reproaches and feuds at the very wedding.

The orator proceeds after this charming preamble to discuss the prevailing poverty and depopulation of Greek cities, and to recommend the wholesome country life of peasants to the indigent idlers through the towns. He notices, among other points, that at Thebes all but the Cadmea was in ruins, with but a small population, and that there too, as in his picture of the city just drawn, a votive Hermes, set up for some victory in flute-playing, now stood up out of weeds among the ruins in the ancient agora. This, then, is the kind of reality to be sought in his story; nor need we be duped into taking it for sober history, because he opens with the traditional falsehood of all good story-tellers, that the thing actually happened to himself. I notice that none of his ancient critics ever dreams of regarding the whole speech as anything but a clever piece of rhetoric. Yet as dramatic poetry is declared to be truer than history, so I take this remarkable sketch of the extreme contrasts of town and country to embody a general truth, though I am disposed to think that most neatherds and goatherds in the wilds of Greece were more like the rustics dressed up by Theocritus than like those of Dion. Both authors draw from their poetical imagination; both testify that in the later days of Hellenism, and in the Alexandria which had gone through all its stages in a single generation, there were a growing respect and attraction towards country life, a wholesome reaction against the opposite tendency, so prevalent in the first days of Hellenism.[1]

There were even ridiculous exaggerations of this return to nature, this living in the freedom of the woods, this contempt of athletic sports as compared with field sports and the life of a hunter. Hertzberg has cited[2] from Plutarch, Apuleius, and Philostratus cases of wild men of the woods imitating the life of Heracles, which was always an ideal with the Cynics, and even posing among the country people as the sons of deified heroes. These personages—we know of at least two—despised every form of culture.

---

[1] Cf. *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 307.

[2] *Geschichte Griechenlands*, Vol. II, p. 286.

But surely the *naturalism* of such life is likely to be more prominent than its simplicity. Among the inscriptions collected at Naples is the following: "We love thickets and caves; without care or ambition is life in the woods. In the woods freedom is attained and rest provided."[1] But the emblems on the *tessera* which contains these simple words are phallic, and it is very plain that the *unreserve* of forest life is the prominent idea in the writer's mind.

We have now come to the end of the lowest and poorest epoch to be found hitherto in the history of Greece. Let us close our chapter, and begin afresh with the gradual rise of Greece, together with all the Empire, under the reformed rule of the Flavian dynasty and their immediate successors.

---

[1] *CIG.*, III, 5814: *δρυμοὺς καὶ ἄντρα φιλοῦμεν· ἄφροντις καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἄνευ ὁ ἐν ὕλαις βίος. ἐν ταῖς ὕλαις ἐλευθερία περιποιεῖται καὶ ἀνάπαυλα ἑτοιμάζεται.* Kaibel, *IGSI.*, 64, considers the inscription a forgery.

CHAPTER XIV

PLUTARCH AND HIS TIMES—PUBLIC LIFE

As our principal authority in the last chapter has been Dion, whose activity reached from Greece eastward, so now we shall endeavour to extract what we can from Plutarch, whose experience is mainly from Greece westward. Dion, too, is plainly an Asiatic Hellenist who looks with contempt on the mother-land as degraded, while Plutarch regards it with true affection as his home, which he will not abandon lest it may lose even a single honest citizen. In a former chapter we sought to learn the temper of the most cultivated Roman society by searching the works of Cicero, and making his personality the centre round which we grouped our details; it will be convenient to adopt the same plan again, and make the sage of Chæronea the spokesman of the better life which still survived in Greece and the Greek world, in the Martinmas summer of its history. The great biographer is not without his faults. As a stylist he is inferior to Lucian, though with better opportunities, and it is only recently and timidly that modern scholarship is reintroducing his *Lives* into the Grecian studies of the young. He is garrulous too, often repeating his little anecdotes, and urging again his old arguments, wanting, moreover, in that humour which is so inestimable a safeguard against platitude and twaddle. But he is very eloquent withal, and very happy in the illustrations he borrows or invents.[1]

Thus, to cite an example or two, he calls the sun the first great prototype of nomad life, seeing that he wanders in his chariot through the pastures of the sky.[2] In the same dialogue he is comparing the relation of God to the soul with that of the soul to the body; "for the body is the instrument of the soul, as the soul is of God, answering to His touch, as to the Scythian does his bow, or to the Greek his lyre." He calls sleep the "lesser mysteries" (the initiation to the great mystery of death). Again, he says:

> The soul is, as it were, enclosed in the body like an oyster in its shell, because it remembers not from what honour or wealth it has been exiled—not from Sardis to Athens, not from Corinth to Lemnos or Scyros, but taking this poor earth in exchange for heaven and the moon; and yet if it be moved here but a little way from place to place, it frets and feels strange, like a poor growth that will not bear transplantation without withering.[3]

There are also pathetic traits of very modern aspect, such as that already quoted.[4] Another very touching passage is that in which he notes the fact that no infant ever smiles in the waking moments of its first few weeks, but only when it falls asleep. This he explains by the Platonic doctrine that the transplanted soul is disturbed and terrified by the aspect of this world, which it regards with displeasure, while in sleep it recalls its happier state with

---

[1] This splendour alternating with prosaic commonplace reminds of Wordsworth, who is so magnificent and again so trivial.

[2] This is in the mouth of the Scythian Anacharsis, *Sept. sap. conv.*, 12.

[3] *De exilio, sub fin.*

[4] Above, p. 321.

God and smiles at the glorious vision.[1] Had Wordsworth known this passage, we should probably now have it in a splendid poetical form.

Still more eloquent than these specimens of poetry-in-prose is that moral dignity which he has given to great historical characters, so that the leading men of the world from his day to our own have been more influenced by the *Parallel Lives* than by any other book we could name, even from the most classical period and of the most classical purity. We feel him, as we feel Sir Walter Scott, not only the originator[2] of an inestimably instructive form of historiography, but also essentially a gentleman—a man of honour and of kindliness, the best type of the best men of his day. He lived, indeed, in times very different from the times of Scott, and in a widely different society. Though far more modern and developed in many respects, the world of Plutarch, with all its arts, its literature, its criticism, had features still clinging to it which we cannot but regard as revolting. These terrible stains on the polished surface of Hellenism, Plutarch and his fellows censured and deplored, but not in the language of disgust and horror which would burst from the lips of any ordinary reader to whom I should dare to present the details. The *naturalism* of the Greek was not extinguished by any amount of refinement; and so we find the amiable and pure-minded sage implying as a matter of course in his advices that a wife must be prepared to overlook her husband's infidelities, provided they are committed away from home; that growing boys will be shown pictures which they must be taught to regard as mere art, to prevent their learning lessons in immorality. So also we find him in a discourse upon the worship of Isis, addressed to Klea, a distinguished priestess of a guild at Delphi, discussing the exhibitions of the generative principle in nature with an unreserve which we should not tolerate in general conservation, not to say in a published missive to a lady.

---

[1] *περὶ ψυχῆς*, fr. 13.

[2] There were, of course, previous biographers, as there were previous novelists, but neither are worth mentioning in comparison with the two great masters.

The fact that these things occur casually in his writings persuades me to treat them as evidence far more valuable than the generalities, often rhetorical, with which he introduces a moral subject, as when, for example, he prefaces his tract on *Brotherly Love* with the stock complaint that this with the other virtues is disappearing from among men, and that now its occurrence is regarded with the same surprise as its absence was in simpler days.[1] There were pure affections, strong attachments, lasting friendships, then as in every epoch of extended culture.

But while every student of Hellenism during this time of Roman influence must admit certain unpleasant features, I protest against employing as historical evidence another writer, largely cited by the German authorities who have discussed the morals of waning Greece. Both Friedländer in his monumental *Sittengeschichte*, and Hertzberg in his meritorious *History*, as well as Göll and others who are mere essayists, make large use of the novel of Apuleius, called his *Metamorphoses*, as giving a fair picture of northern Greece and its society in the generation now before us.

[1] Hertzberg (Vol. II, p. 283) quotes this statement just as other German critics quote the famous reflections in Thucydides' third book, without any suspicion or any feeling of their exaggeration.

It tells the adventures of one Lucius (a purely Latin name), who narrates in the first person that his family on the father's side had its ancestors in Athens, Sparta, and Corinth, while his mother's relations are to be found in Thessaly. The father's pedigree has all the appearance of a clumsy attempt to assert respectability among the ignorant by parading a catalogue of famous city names. The mother's connection was required by the plot of the book, for Lucius must be brought to Thessaly to stumble upon the witchcraft and witches whom the poets had long since located there, and a great Thessalian lady, who is his maternal aunt, plays a prominent part for some chapters. The mother, however, of this Attico-Corintho-Spartan Lucius, who herself hails from Thessaly, is also called in good Latin Salvia, and his aunt Byrrhæna. He says he was nurtured as a boy at Athens, and learned Latin at Rome with difficulty, and this he makes an excuse for his style. But if this style has faults, if it has a Greek and an artificial flavour, it is surely not from late or imperfect knowledge of Latin. No author of the period is richer in vocabulary, more profuse in rhetoric, more various in idiom. Exuberance is the main characteristic of his writing. The danger which he felt arose from another cause. He was translating and adapting from Greek stories, and says it plainly enough in his opening words. He calls his novel a *Græcanica fabula*. He interlards it perpetually with digressive tales very like in character to those of the *Decamerone*. These were the "Milesian Tales" which he utilised, and which we find worked up into the later Greek novels of Xenophon Ephesius, Achilles Tatius, and others.[1]

---

[1] They are collected in the *Scriptores erotici Græci*, published in the Teubner series, and edited by Hercher.

He is, in fact, repeating Greek fairy-tales or robber stories, and placing them in a geography of his own.

He begins, as I have said, in Thessaly, for he desired to dilate upon witchcraft and describe the transformation of his hero by these arts into an ass. But where is the *nobilissima civitas*, the renowned city of Hypata, in which his hero begins his adventures? It is not known to Strabo in his careful survey of the Thessalian towns. It never appeared prominently, except only in one long-past campaign, that of the Romans against Antiochus the Great and the Ætolians,[1] though Thessaly was so often "Mars' orchestra."

During most of the succeeding adventures and wanderings of the transformed hero with his various masters, the author confines himself to the formula, *devenimus in aliam quandam nobilem civitatem*, "we come to another distinguished city;" and it is well, for when he does attempt closer precision and describes an assault of robbers upon Thebes, he imagines this city upon the seacoast!

---

[1] The only literary occurrence of the name I can find is in Livy, xxxvi, 16–30, where he copies from Polybius the details of this war, and Hypata is the usual meeting-place for negotiations between the Roman Lucius and the Ætolians. It is called there a town of Thessaly, but was really the central town of the Ænianes on the northern slopes of Mount Œta. Strabo (ix, 4. 11) says they were completely ruined by the Ætolians and the Athamanians under King Amynander. He mentions no town on the north slope of Œta, and seems to have little information about the district. Had Hypata then been of the smallest note, it could not possibly have escaped him. I will add that Hertzberg (Vol. II, p. 19, note) cites from Ross an inscription mentioning the friendship of a citizen of Hypata with Germanicus, and *CIL.*, III, 586, alludes to a quarrel between Hypata and Lamia. There are a few Greek inscriptions in which the name occurs: *CIG.*, 1717, 1774, etc., and another in *BCH.*, Vol. I, p. 120. Pliny (*Hist. Nat.*, xxv, 5. 49) alludes to its hellebore. Hertzberg expresses only a faint doubt about the splendour of this Hypata (Vol. II, p. 209).

The robbers, being beaten off with the loss of two of their leaders, think it best to bury them in the sea before retiring to the neighbouring Platæa! And here a rich citizen was preparing to give a great entertainment in the way of a gladiatorial show with numbers of wild beasts to his *fellow-citizens*—at Platæa! We know, indeed, from Pausanias that the old temples still stood there, and that yearly and five-yearly feasts were still celebrated in honour of the ancient victories over the Persians. But if every indication we have both in Pausanias and Strabo be not false, Platæa was like all its neighbours a decayed and empty village, living upon the tourists who came to see its antiquities, and only waking up annually to receive those who gathered to celebrate its venerable feasts.

The whole geography of the book is, therefore, either from ignorance or deliberate carelessness, unreal, and full of such violations of fact as the author could have avoided by any superficial acquaintance with northern Greece. His account of Corinth, on the other hand, speaks of clear personal knowledge. He knows the new and brilliant city; he knows its harbours, and the feasts celebrated there to Isis and other deities. But here it is that he portrays to us such a state of public morals that I refuse to accept his evidence for the social condition of even the Greek towns which he knew. He not only describes the most monstrous immoralities as being committed by women of wealth and position with impunity, but, when they become known, preparations being actually made to repeat these hideous violations of all natural decency in the public theatre for the amusement of the populace. It is impossible for me to repeat a single detail in the story. But I am convinced that, very Roman as was the complexion of New Corinth, very immoral as was the atmosphere of that city at all times, very extravagant as may have been the license of the many oriental traders who resorted thither —and we know what the sport of orientals is from the *Arabian Nights*—no such exhibition could ever have been tolerated in any civilised city of the first century, save only at Rome, and at the court of Nero in Rome. Suetonius —and is he credible?—tells us of similar bestialities performed before Nero,[1] and it is here only that our author could have found the facts, which he adapted to another scene. If such things ever were thought of at Corinth, it was in imitation of the orgies of Nero.

I suggest, therefore, that the strange book of Apuleius, with its mixture of extravagant obscenity, enthusiastic ritualism, gross naturalism culminating in the strictest piety, was written with a strong Roman flavour by a Roman, for the depraved society of Nero's court, and that the crimes piled up upon the Greeks of Thessaly and Bœotia are partly the gross inventions of the Milesian fablers, partly the depraved imaginings of that emperor's intimates. We might as well charge all society in France with being addicted to one form of vice, because recent French fiction occupies itself almost exclusively with this as the material for its plots. The society *for which such books are written* must have shown that they are to its taste; the society *which such books portray* may be wholly different, and grossly libelled by being made to reflect the vices of the author and his readers.

The whole problem is complicated by the fact that a novel attributed to Lucian, called *The Ass*, but now rejected from his works by critical editors, gives the same story in a much briefer form, with close similarity of detail, but omitting many of the irrelevant digressions of Apuleius, as well as his pious conclusion.

---

[1] *Nero*, 12; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv, 37; Sueton., *Nero*, 12. 29.

It is perfectly plain either that one of them has copied the other, or that both have copied from a common source. The now prevalent theory seems to be that Apuleius copied and enlarged Lucian's story; but there is this grave difficulty, that both writers were nearly contemporary; indeed, I am not sure that we can prove Lucian the senior. Internal evidences are to me still more destructive of the theory. I ask any man of common-sense: Is it more likely that a superstitious and enthusiastic writer should have taken for his model a scurrilous and sceptical story and grafted his piety on this stock, or that a sceptic should have taken from a verbose and ample original, full of superstition and devotion, the substance for a more compendious satire upon such old wives' fables? The date of both authors, however, being clearly beyond the limits of this volume—for they lived under Hadrian and the Antonines—I should not have entered upon this discussion, were it not that both, in my opinion, borrowed from an older Greek original, *The Metamorphosis of Lucius of Patræ*, which the patriarch Photius[1] read along with the story of Lucian, and then expresses his hesitation which of the two was the original. He decides very sensibly that Lucius (or the author of *Lucius*) is the prior, because he is much fuller, and because he writes in a credulous and naïve spirit. These are the very features which distinguish the version of Apuleius from that of Lucian, so that the inference seems obvious that we have in Apuleius' work a more faithful copy of the (now lost) original which Lucian, or some brother-sceptic, reduced in length, traduced in spirit, and produced independently of the Latin version. This *Lucius* of Patræ, then, must have been written within the first century (probably under Nero), if the work became, early in the next, the model of an African, as well as a Syrian, author, both of whom probably learned to know it during their early studies at Athens.

---

[1] *Codex*, 129.

But the arguments above urged against the historical value of Apuleius' copy still lie against the citizen of Patræ. The introduction concerning his journey and the company on the way, with stories interlarded somewhat in Chaucer's fashion, gives us a real picture of what a citizen of the Roman colony of Patræ, a Greek with a Roman name, would know familiarly. But his deliberate intention is to be fabulous, and to assert the powers of magic and the violations of nature to be leading facts in our daily life. These are the reasons which forbid me to follow the example of Hertzberg,[1] and to entertain my readers with marvellous tales of robbers, and of the wealth and refinement of country towns in Thessaly. Such simplicity in a critic is no doubt refreshing to a reader, but only instructive as a psychological study. Let us return to the soberer Plutarch.

The general effect produced by the many pictures, allusions, references, illustrations which he takes from the Greek world of his times is that romantic adventures, great passions, monstrous crimes, were foreign to the small and shabby gentility of Roman Greece. The highest rewards he can set before the keenest ambition are no better than if we should now fire our youths' imaginations with the prospect of becoming parish beadles, vestrymen, or at most town councillors. He confesses honestly that a rescript from the Roman governor brooks no delay in obedience, and that all attempts to stir up a spirit of real independence are worse than futile. This was what drove sterner and stronger spirits into the refuge of philosophy, the Cynic's cloak and beard, the Stoic's contempt of worldly goods, the Epicurean's patronising smile at the trivial storms of local politics.

---

[1] *Gesch. Griech.*, Vol. II, pp. 281 *sq.*

But Plutarch was a man who abhorred extremes. He loved compromises. In philosophy his adherence to the Academy was loose even for that very broad and undogmatic school. It would be hard to say whether the Stoic dogmas which he rejects exceed in number those which he quotes with approval. While he inculcates submission to the powers that be, he is always advocating a spirit of dignified independence almost inconsistent with that submission. While he teaches monotheism and the spirituality of God in words of splendour, and while he feels the strength and comfort of religion pure and undefiled, he will not abandon the old temples and their sacrifices. Even the vulgar prose responses of the rustic Pythia and her proletarian priests, interpreting the advice of Apollo upon questions too trivial to deserve a literary reply—even this he defends with his conservative spirit because the oracle is old, because it was once highly honoured and is still morally useful; he also devises many subtle and plausible arguments to support his opinion. He will not adopt with Plato the equality of the sexes, or with the Stoics the injustice of slavery, or with the Pythagoreans the rights of the lower animals; yet he goes a long way with all three—magnifying the position and the dignity of the house-mother both by example and precept, inculcating everywhere kindness and consideration to slaves, adopting even vegetarian doctrines in some of his earlier treatises, and upholding with satire and with paradox the superior insight and intelligence of the animals we patronise or oppress.

His leading feature—and he lets us see that he is both conscious and proud of it—is sympathy with all his fellows; his leading ambition is, in consequence, to act as adviser and director to all that need it—from the king on his throne and the councillor in his ripe old age, to the giddy youth and reckless child. We have in every society instances of that amiable vanity which is, indeed, not uncommon in advanced age among those who love their fellows, and think that the lapse of years has of necessity brought wisdom in the wake of ample experience.

We may notice that this general direction of consciences assumed by Plutarch is very much confined to Greek life and habits, and applicable only in a general way to Romans. He dedicates, indeed, many of his treatises to Sossius Senecio, and other distinguished persons at Rome, where he had delivered public lectures when a young man.[1] The atmosphere of Rome, however, seems to have been distasteful to him, and he spent all his mature life in Chæronea, perhaps as distinctly the last of the Greeks as his contemporaries Juvenal and Tacitus are "the last of the Romans."

---

[1] *De curios.*, 15: "Once when I was lecturing at Rome, and that Rusticus whom Domitian afterwards put to death from envy of his reputation was among the audience, an orderly came right through the room and handed him a missive from Cæsar. So when there

Let us develop into detail some of these general statements. We must remember, when weighing Plutarch's statements concerning the politics still possible for an ambitious Greek, that, whether from the influence of the great master of his school, Plato, or from a practical view of things similar to that of Polybius—indeed, of all the literary classes in all ages of Greek life—he was strongly opposed to democracy in the modern sense. He regards the lowering of the franchise to include free paupers as idle and mischievous. He thinks that monarchy is ideally the most perfect state;[1] he is perhaps alone among literary Greeks in admitting the justice and the usefulness of many historical tyrants;[2] he holds that the liberties still accorded to the Greek towns are as much as they can bear. What they have lost, he thinks, is counterbalanced by the peace and security afforded through Roman sway.

> For see,[3] if we enumerate the greatest blessings which polities[4] enjoy—peace, liberty, material prosperity, populous-

---

was silence, as I paused that he might read the letter, he would not, and refused to open it till my lecture was over and the audience dismissed." An interesting glimpse into a Greek lecture-room at Rome.

[1] *De monarch.*, etc., 4. In the various definitions of a democracy put into the mouths of the seven sages, if that dialogue be genuine (*Sept. sap. conviv.*, 11), the will of the majority is never once mentioned as a mark.

[2] *De sera num.*, 6–8.

[3] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 32.

[4] I think it best to use this old-fashioned word to describe that sort of community which is a single city and yet counts as a separate state, the Greek πόλις, of which Monaco, San Marino, and Hamburg are, or were up to our own generation, modern examples.

ness, harmony—as far as *peace* is concerned, the communities have nothing to desire from their politicians; every Greek, every barbarian, war has departed from us and vanished;[1] as regards *liberty*, they have as much as the rulers accord to such communities, and perhaps as much as is good for them.[2] *Good seasons* and *populousness* are blessings to be sought from the gods.[3]

But while he goes on to advise against *discord*, which can be allayed only by the skill and good temper of local leaders, it is very interesting that he feels, almost like Edmund Burke,[4] the value of parties in each state.

His examples are, indeed, derived from the political days of Greece, but the passage is very interesting.[5] Since every public is ill-natured and censorious towards its politicians, and suspects that whatever is done without opposition and debate is managed by a sort of conspiracy (for which reason political clubs and brotherhoods are in such bad repute), no just cause for hatred and variance must be allowed. We should act like Onomademus, demagogue of the Chians, who, when he got the upper hand in a political struggle, would not allow all his opponents to be banished, "lest we begin to quarrel with our friends when no enemies are left us." This was perhaps silly, adds Plutarch, and then, with his usual habit of compromise:

---

[1] See a parallel passage on the safety and comfort of life at this time, *de tranquillitate*, ii.

[2] ἐλευθερίας δέ, ὅσον οἱ κρατοῦντες νέμουσι τοῖς δήμοις, μέτεστι, καὶ τὸ πλέον ἴσως οὐκ ἄμεινον.

[3] The rest of this important passage I shall quote in the sequel. Here is another casual piece of evidence. A friend gallops out on horseback to announce to the company talking together at Helicon (Thespiæ) that a fair widow in Thebes has just kidnapped a youth whom she desires to marry. The excited rider introduces his news thus: "Ye gods, what will be the end of this liberty, which is upsetting our polity? For now matters have passed through autonomy into lawlessness" (anomy—a pun).

[4] Cf. W. H. Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. III, pp. 196 *sq.*, for a masterly statement of the uses and abuses of party government, and a comparison of it with the rule of the "best men" selected from all parties.

[5] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 16. Cf. also the remark of Melanthius (*de aud. poet.*, 4), that Athens was saved by the conflicts of her politicians.

> But when the crowd is suspicious of some great and salutary measure, it is inexpedient that all the speakers should agree about it, as if by prearrangement, but two or three should dissent, and oppose in a friendly way the proposal, and then give in after some persuasion. For in this way, appearing to be convinced by sound arguments, they will carry with them the populace. Also in trifling matters it is better that members of the government should have and express real differences of opinion, so that on vital matters their harmony shall not appear preconcerted. It is only a finer form of the old adage attributed to Jason, the famous tyrant of Pheræ: "Those who desire to do justice in great things must be unjust in small."[1]

Here we have an antique example, as is usual with Plutarch; when he illustrates his precepts by recent cases, we generally find ourselves balked by ignorance of all the details, as is so often the case with our reading of Aristotle's *Politics*.

There is one famous figure in the older days which we seek in vain throughout Plutarch's world—the demagogue who gained power and wealth by virulent political opposition, whose public spirit and private ends were so interwoven that the most diverse judgments upon his honesty and policy could be equally justified. Such were men of the type of Cleon, Caius Gracchus, even Julius Cæsar, to take the most brilliant examples. All scope for this kind of talent was now gone. If there was indeed a low, self-seeking person, with whom ambition was the mainspring of action, he no longer courted the *demos* of his town, even were it Athens or Ephesus, but the Roman governors, or the Roman court,[1] if he could contrive to go on an embassy to the capital. We hear constantly from Plutarch of this type, which seems to have invaded even social life to a degree unknown and intolerable to us.[2] The higher class of demagogue, the man of true political ambition, had no field whatever left for his energies. In the sequel of the passage above cited, he tells us:

---

[1] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 24. It is the reverse of a famous observation in Machiavelli's *Principe*, whose great injustices are to be prepared and rendered possible by the reputation of strict justice in trifles.

> Nothing else remains than this, which is not less important than any of the other blessings I have enumerated, in producing harmony and good-will among those that dwell together, and allaying all strife and variance, as one would among personal friends; I mean first approaching the party that feel most aggrieved, identifying oneself with their griefs and repeating their complaints, then gradually soothing them, and teaching them that men who forego their victory in a quarrel are superior, not only in gentleness, but in loftiness and greatness of soul; and that a small concession will now give them a great and substantial victory. And then one should teach them both individually

---

[1] It is, I think, remarkable that all through this tract *On Policy* Plutarch never alludes to the communal flattery of the towns which awarded divine honours, not only to the emperors who claimed them (such as Caligula and Nero), but to those who repudiated them, nay, even to their female relations (Livia, Drusilla, etc.), and even to provincial governors like Lucullus and Censorinus. This was surely the most prominent, and is to us the most disgraceful, flattery of the day. The tract *Whether Vice Suffices for Misery* opens with an amusing account of what we call *snobbery*, of people who thrust themselves forward uninvited, and submit to all manner of trouble, insult, and neglect in order to carry off some memento of the favour of kings.

[2] Cf. his whole tract *On the Flatterer and Friend*.

> and collectively the weak condition of Greek polities, fit to enjoy thorough quiet and concord, if men of sense will make the best of it, since fortune has left us no higher prize to win. For what glory, what dominion, is left for those that prevail; what power, which a brief mandate of a proconsul hath not abolished or transformed; nay, even if it remain, is it worth any trouble? For as a conflagration seldom starts from temples or public buildings, but some lamp neglected in a private house, or a rubbish-heap set on fire has set up a great blaze and wrought public loss and damage, so public rivalries do not always precede a revolution, but differences starting from private affairs have often broken into public affairs, and upset the whole polity.

He proceeds to illustrate this principle by cases notorious to his hearers, but now passed into oblivion.

Dion, in whom we can find passages parallel to most of Plutarch's pages, says very similar things in his forty-eighth oration, addressed to his countrymen at Prusa. He entreats them to settle their differences peaceably, now that the excellent Varenus, the Roman governor, has allowed them again the right of public meeting, and above all things to make no difficulties about accounting for the public money, into which Varenus will certainly enquire, whether they like it or not. The orator describes the same condition of things which Pliny's *Letters* show from the Roman point of view.

It is this altered state of public life which justifies Plutarch's portrait of the ideal Greek citizen, the popular man in the true sense of the word; a portrait which we cannot but suspect to be intended for his own; for the naïve self-consciousness of the man appears through every part of his works. In this, as in so many other features, both of his inner spirit and his outward surroundings, does he remind us of Polybius, whose principles and policy, though adopted at the very outset of this decadence, were so closely analogous. Upon this resemblance I desire particularly to insist, for I know no more remarkable evidence of the persistence of the same kind of life and thinking in Greece for at least two hundred years.

Here is the portrait in question: First of all let him be easy of access, and the common property of all, keeping open house, as it were a harbour of refuge to all that need it; showing his protection and his generosity, not merely in cases of want and by active help, but also by sympathy with the afflicted, and rejoicing with those that rejoice; never annoying others by bringing with him a crowd of attendants to the public baths, or by securing good places at the theatre; never notorious for his offensive luxury and lavishness, but living like the rest of his neighbours in dress and diet, in the bringing up of his children, and the appointments of his wife, as intending to be a man and a citizen on a par with the public about him. He should also be ever ready to give friendly advice and gratuitous advocacy, and offer sympathetic arbitration in differences of man and wife, friend and friend, spending no small part of the day on the bema[1] or in the market-place, and in all his other life drawing to him, as the south wind does the clouds, wants and trust from all sides, serving the state with his private thoughts, and not regarding politics, as many do, a troublesome business or tax upon his time, but rather a life's work. By these and other such means he attracts and attaches to him the public, which contrasts the bastard and spurious fawning and bribing in others with this man's genuine public spirit and character.[1]

---

[1] From which, as from the French *tribune*, councillors seem to have addressed the assembled people.

There had been days when such a man would have hoped for absolute sway in his city; nor do Plutarch's tirades against tyrants, copied from the commonplaces of the old dispossessed aristocrats, outweigh his distinct preference for the rule of one man, whose duty it once had been, if he were convinced of his own fitness, to assume the diadem. But now all that a popular politician could gain was the responsibility and burden of expensive honorary duties. In the tract *Upon Exile*, a very rhetorical performance, which rather argues a case than expresses a conviction, the main profit of exile is represented as the escape from these duties. "You have no longer a fatherland dragging at you, bothering you, ordering you about; crying: 'pay taxes, go on an embassy to Rome, entertain the governor, undertake public festivals.'" Of these requirements I fancy the journeys to Rome must have been the most exacting. For though very young men might greatly enjoy a trip to the capital, even with the risk of dying abroad,[2] the envoys sent with formal compliments, in the hope of obtaining real benefits, were more likely to be elderly men; they were not certain to find the emperor at Rome, and must follow him even to the pillars of Hercules, or at least through Italy, where the innkeepers were notorious extortioners;[3] and, moreover, the waiting in anterooms, the insolence of Roman senators and imperial officials, must have been galling even to an obsequious Greek. We can well imagine how the public at home, who were ready to accord them statues and honourary inscriptions if they succeeded, would treat them if they returned without gaining their object—by far the most likely result. But of these failures we have not, of course, many records, and these I shall examine in due course. We have now to consider the many inscriptions which rewarded the successes of such missions.

---

[1] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 31.

[2] Like the youth lamented by Crinagoras, who seems to have been one of the attendants on such an embassy (cf. Cichorius, *Rom und Mytilene*, p. 53).

[3] *Symp.*, ii, 1: "Worse than the Italian inn-keepers, who on the eve of a battle, when the enemy are upon them, keep an accurate account how much liquor each man who dined with them has consumed."

One cannot but wonder how the extraordinary profusion of these latter, even among the scanty remains still extant, did not so detract from their value as to make them utterly contemptible, like the innumerable crowns to be gained at various local contests, which Plutarch calls mere rubbish (συρφετός). Long since a Roman conqueror had refused the honour of a statue in Corinth with the remark, *turmales sibi displicere*, "that he did not like the squad."[1] But the adherence of the Greeks to honours and occupations once dignified, and hallowed by long use, seems incapable of feeling the effects of wear and tear, the stress of disgust, or the shafts of ridicule. All these pompous enumerations of civic virtues and benefits went on from generation to generation, and now became one of the main features in public life.

The desire of semi-Hellenistic dynasts to be thus honoured, and inscribed on stone as benefactors of the Greeks, was of course very natural, and we have already found in Herod a specimen of that type. The inscriptions afford us many more. Thus[1] Ariobarzanes Philopator, king of Cappadocia late in the first century B. C., is lauded for having restored, with the help of Roman builders, the Odeum at Athens, burnt in the Mithradatic war. His son Eusebes Philo-Romæus is honoured by the Athenian people. Again,[2] the last descendant of King Juba, Ptolemy (who was put to death by Caligula), is commended for adorning the statue of his ancestor, "the Egyptian Ptolemy." These were kings, but there are many mere Roman citizens mentioned in these inscriptions from Athens.[3] We find, moreover, constant compliments paid to citizens of other cities in Greece.

---

[1] Cicero, *de orat.*, ii, 65. The argument urged above (p. 312) also applies in this more special case.

For I will add that if the centralising of the world's power at Rome had as yet failed to produce any real unity of sentiment throughout the Empire, it had at least produced, after so many abortive attempts in earlier history, a real social unity throughout Greece. Thus Plutarch lays the scenes of his entertainments and friendly conversations almost indiscriminately through Greece, at Delphi, Athens, Hyampolis, Elis, Ædepsus, Thespiæ, Corinth, without any other feeling than that Greeks are all friends and neighbours. Apuleius, if he were to be trusted, makes the wealthy society of Hypata even quite Roman in style, and describes many specially Roman luxuries at the feast of Byrrhæna, who behaves like a very free Roman lady, not like a Greek. I think the lists of *proxeni* recently discovered, informing the citizens of each place, who intended to travel, whom they would find in each city, ready to be their official friend, are very significant. We have from Narthakion in Thessaly[1] even a list of the *proxeni* of other cities residing in that town, so that the stranger on his arrival could at once find his official host. We have also many inscriptions telling us of arbitrations in local quarrels by Greek cities quite remote from the disputants, and not connected with them by any but the general bond of Hellenism.[2]

---

[1] *CIA.*, II, 481, p. 297 = *CIG.*, I, 358.

[2] *CIA.*, III, 555 = *CIG.*, I, 360. This sort of decree is preserved in hundreds of examples.

[3] Here is a specimen *CIA.*, III, 570 = *CIG.*, I, 367: *ὁ δῆμος Μάρκον Ἀρτώριον εὐεργεσίας καὶ εὐνοίας ἕνεκα.* He was a physician of Augustus, drowned after the battle of Actium.

Plutarch shows us a greater conservative persistence in the second main department of public life, *religion*—ritual and festivals which were the public relaxation, as contrasted with politics which were still the pretended business, of every Greek polity. On this side of life the information our author gives us is not less explicit, and full of the same inconsistencies. It will be understood that for the present I shall omit all account of philosophy as a school of morals, a very notable part of Greek religion in one sense, but wholly dissociated from the traditional rites and ceremonies, and the traditional theologies, of the people. It is the general effect as regards public worship in the temples and at oracles, and at the established festivals, which I seek now to derive from Plutarch. Nor is the task very easy with a man of compromises, who desires to adopt reforms and yet retain the old courses, who would be a philosopher and yet a defender of tradition. I think his real attitude is best to be gathered from the following very noble passage:

---

[1] *BCH.*, Vol. VI, p. 587.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 247.

> For the deity is not a thing without soul or spirit under the hand of man [he has just been censuring the use of Demeter for wheat, and of Dionysus for wine], but of such material gifts have we considered the gods to be the givers, who grant them to us continuously and adequately—the gods who differ not one from the other, as barbarian and Greek, as of the south or of the north; but if the sun and the moon, and heaven, earth, and sea, are the same to all, though they be called by different names, so for the One Reason that sets all these things in order and the One Providence that controls them, and for the subordinate forces that direct each several department, various honours and titles have been established by law among divers nations, and men use hallowed symbols, here obscure, there clearer, which lead our thoughts to God, not without risk of failure; for some have slipped altogether from the path, and fallen into superstition, while others, avoiding the slough of superstition, have gone over the precipice of atheism.[1]

All the peculiarities of Plutarch's theology are here stated or implied. If he meant to uphold the many foreign rituals which had come into Hellenism from the old religions of Asia Minor and of Egypt, especially those of Isis and of Mithra, he must hold the identity of many local gods of various names; and this is the main purpose of his long treatise on Isis and Osiris—Isis, whose worship we find established in a special temple at Pompeii on a par with the Helleno-Roman gods; Osiris, into whose worship Klea, the high-priestess of the (Dionysiac) Thyiadæ at Delphi, was initiated by right of heredity.[2] He tries to show in myriad instances that the rituals of Egyptians and Greeks were the same in idea; and, as regards the myths, he has recourse to either of the explanatory processes which he strongly deprecates when their consequences are carried out boldly—rationalism and allegory. The former was the Epicurean, the latter the Stoic device, adopted, of course, by other schools in their turn. Plutarch will adopt them only when they suit his convenience, and supplements them with another "theory of evasion" which made a great noise in the early Christian controversies. I mean his doctrine[1] of *demons*, or beings intermediate between man and God, who are both beneficent and maleficent, in fact both angels and devils, and to whom are to be attributed all the polytheistic vagaries of popular mythology. The so-called immoralities of the gods, so great a stumbling-block to every sober critic, were all to be referred to the maleficent demons.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 35.

[2] *De Iside*, 67.

But there was another and a greater difficulty, which has not yet departed from theology. I mean the explanation, not of the alleged immoralities committed by the gods, but of human immoralities being permitted by them without inflicting condign punishment. This difficulty was then, and has been ever since, one of the strongest stays of atheism. Nor could Plutarch appeal, like modern apologists, to a firm belief in future rewards and punishments, even though he does compose a long myth at the end of his treatise, in imitation of the close of Plato's *Republic*, wherein Nero's soul appears studded with red-hot nails,[2] and wherein, along with the usual tortures of hell, the delights of the Elysian fields are also portrayed. But this is only an appendix to his apology, which takes a line analogous to that of Bishop Butler, yet with an eloquence and richness of illustration very different from the tame and unattractive logic of the good bishop. The notable instances of punishment after many years are evidences that Divine Providence is not forgetful. Hurry and precipitation are human faults and foreign to an eternal being. And though there seems to have been delay, how can we know that we are not merely displaying our ignorance in asserting it? Who knows whether the criminal all the while has not been bearing his own cross to the scene of his final punishment?[1] Who knows whether, instead of being punished in old age, he has not grown old in punishment?[2]

---

[1] Dr. Purser points out to me that Plutarch rather popularised than originated this doctrine, and himself refers it (*ibid.*, 25; *def. orac.*, 17) to various older philosophers. Diogenes L. refers it (vii, 151) to the Stoics. Mr. Sayce tells me it came from Babylonia.

[2] *De sera num. vind.*, *sub fin.* He adds, with comical pathos, that, being of a musical turn, Nero was presently to be turned into a marsh-frog, for that he had expiated part of his misdoings by his conduct towards Greece: ὀφείλεσθαι δέ τι καὶ χρηστὸν αὐτῷ παρὰ θεῶν, ὅτι

Here is one more remarkable passage:

> Let us further consider this, that setting things right in human tribunals consists in requiting with evil, in making the ill-doer suffer ill, and in nothing further [correctionary punishments seem unknown in Greek codes]; wherefore they pursue the offender barking at him like a dog, and follow up the crime hot-foot. We must rather expect God, whatever diseased soul He treats with correction, to judge its passions, whether they will give way to repentance, and to allow time for recovery to those whose wickedness is not absolute and ineradicable. For knowing what share of virtue human souls brought with them when

---

τῶν ὑπηκόων τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον γένος ἠλευθέρωσεν, τὴν Ἑλλάδα. This survival of national folly and vanity is very interesting in Plutarch.

[1] *καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος κακουργῶν ἐκφέρει τὸν αὑτοῦ σταυρόν*, *op. cit.*, 9.

[2] *οὐ μετὰ πλείονα χρόνον, ἀλλ' ἐν πλείονι χρόνῳ, τιμωρίαν μακροτέραν οὐ βραδυτέραν τίνουσιν· οὐδὲ γηράσαντες ἐκολάσθησαν, ἀλλ' ἐγήρασαν κολαζόμενοι.*

they came from Him to their birth, and how strong in them and inextinguishable is this nobility of origin, and that they "come out" upon the surface with wickedness when impaired by bad nurture and evil company, but when properly treated recover their natural health—knowing all this, He does not apply the same punishment to all, but extirpates what is incurable forthwith from the world, as it is offensive to the rest, and most of all to Himself, to see wickedness ever in his presence. But to those whose fault arises rather from ignorance of the right than deliberate choice of the vile, He gives time for repentance; and if they persist, them too He punishes; for with him there is no fear lest they should escape.[1]

I will not apologise for bringing the opinions of the sage at this length before the reader, for as they are not revolutionary or peculiar opinions, held by a reformer or original thinker, but essentially those of a man of practical sense and common wisdom, they express to us what I will call the religious current of the age.

It was noticed by all Roman observers, and appears clearly from the later inscriptions which form the main body of Boeckh's great collection, that in religious rites and usages Greece was extraordinarily conservative. So far as this regards the celebration of festivals, which were always religious meetings, it is, I think, partly to be explained by the popularity of these meetings among all the wealthy Roman and other visitors, who came to Greece for this purpose, not to speak of the exiles who were allowed to attend them. The Olympic, Isthmian, and Pythian festivals seem to me to have been somewhat like the Passion Play at Oberammergau in attracting crowds of strangers—a play which is perhaps still a real cult, but which will certainly be kept up for financial reasons when its religious fervour has passed away. To the antiquarian visitor, however, the ruder local usages, and the many local celebrations of old historic events, like the battles of Marathon and Platæa, were even more interesting, and of these there is a long catalogue.[1] Even the remaining aristocracy of Greece was mainly an aristocracy of religion. The list of the ἐργαστῖναι, who worked the sacred peplos for Athene at Athens in 98 B. C., are all noble names, chosen from the old tribes (φυλαί).[2] I have already alluded to the priestly aristocracy of Stratoniceia.[3] We also know from inscriptions that the three ancient Doric tribes—the Hylleis, Pamphyli, and Dymanes—existed in various Doric polities in Hellenistic days,[4] at Cos, Calymnæ, and at Nemea. There was still the bloody scourging of youths at Sparta, already mentioned, and other remains of gloomy rites, such as that of Orchomenos, at which a priest with a sword pursued certain daughters of the old Minyæ, to allay an ancient curse.[5]

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 6.

---

[1] Cf. Hertzberg, Vol. II, pp. 256 *sq.* Pausanias, in his *Description of Greece*, which we can now study with such satisfaction in Mr. Frazer's monumental edition, turns aside in every city or village of the country to tell us of rude local cults, often forgotten, or Hellenised gods, which show that even the primitive worships of pre-Hellenic Greece lasted to his day—the second century after Christ.

[2] *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VIII, p. 61.

[3] Above, p. 264, and *BCH.*, Vol. XI, p. 35.

[4] *BCH.*, Vol. VIII, p. 29; Vol. IX, p. 351.

[5] But, when, in the course of this ceremony, the priest actually performed the duty, and slew a woman, there was a commotion even greater than had the emperor abolished the custom, and the people took from the offending priest's family this hereditary dignity (Plutarch, *Quæst. græc.*, 38).

But I think this natural conservatism was helped by meaner reasons, and I do not believe in the very strict adherence to old dogmas of people who were so ready to admit foreign rites. The worship of Isis seems now as diffused over Greece as any other, and perhaps more popular, and yet this was distinctly a novel worship as compared with the venerable shrines and historic celebrations already mentioned. Osiris, too, and Serapis had their temples and their priests; and though there were not wanting many assertions of their real identity with some Hellenic god—Isis with Demeter and the others with Dionysus—such cults were really foreign, the people who conducted them were chiefly foreign, and not in harmony with the simple and unquestioning natives who went on repeating the old services and consulting the old oracles.[1] In the better classes we must assume an increasing carelessness for these rites, and, where spiritual wants were indeed felt, a desire to seek satisfaction either in some new revelation or in the philosophic life. But there was no decided break with the old and the superstitious, unless it be among the trenchant spirits who deliberately chose to violate the decencies of religious fashion.[2]

This sort of compromise between orthodoxy and the freedom of advanced spirits was in Plutarch's day very much as it is now. The philosophers had shown endless difficulties, and had adopted a broader and more cosmopolitan conception of the Deity and His relation to the world; just as now our sceptics will not allow the exclusive claims of particular churches, or exclusive creeds, while they usually admit some general basis for them all. In respectable society and among people who read and think, but are not prepared to break with tradition, we have a public very like that of Plutarch, holding a good many of the new truths, confessing them, when pressed, to be inconsistent with the teaching of their church, and yet living on in a sort of practical compromise, gladly hearing every defence of the old, while they read with curiosity and not without approval the assertions of the new.

---

[1] This foreign tone was particularly strong in the religious clubs or associations in the mercantile cities; cf. above, p. 214.

[2] These questions have now been fully and admirably handled, from the Roman side, in Professor Dill's *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.*

Perhaps the strongest objection to this comparison will be made by those who read the tract *On Superstition*, in which they will find, not only that there are no future punishments threatened to the atheist, his belief being regarded as a vagary of thought rather regrettable than detestable, but that the fault of atheism is distinctly regarded as less than that of superstition. Nothing shocked the worthy divines of the Renaissance more than this un-Christian attitude in a moralist otherwise very much akin to Christianity, and there were not wanting those who even accused him in consequence of being an atheist in disguise.[1]

I cannot but think that an attentive study of this tract will show it to be one of those sophistical exercises practised by every one in that age—I mean the defence of a paradox with subtlety and ingenuity, taking little account of sober truth in comparison with dialectical plausibility.

[1] Cf. the citations in Oct. Gréard, *La morale de Plutarque*, pp. 288 *sq.* and notes.

Plutarch opened his career by giving such lectures at Rome, and good critics have already noticed how several of his tracts have the air of mere juvenile declamations.[1] But they have not noticed the introduction, in some of the more serious treatises, of sophistical passages intended to show the author's acuteness and education in rhetoric; as, for example, the grotesque passage on the swallow as an inhospitable and wicked bird;[2] the debate on the comparative intelligence of marine and land animals; the carefully polished argument in which one of Circe's hogs (*Gryllus*) proves to Ulysses the great moral superiority of beasts over men; the laudation of *exile* in a man of strong patriotism and attachment to his home; and many of the silly questions proposed for discussion at his *Banquet*. The exaggerations and understatements with which the tract *On Superstition* abounds, the brief and sketchy nature of the argument, the highly-coloured picture of the terrors of superstition compared with the calmness and ease of atheism, the total absence of all mention either of the special cults which promote the former vice or of the special sex which has always been subject to it—these and many other details make me regard it as a picture suggested perhaps by the popular play of Menander (*The Superstitious Man*), but not as describing any prevalent type in the society of his day. Perhaps the portrait of the Flatterer, to which I have already alluded, suffers from a like exaggeration. But

[1] Gréard (*op. cit.*, p. 41) cites as examples the *comparative usefulness of water and fire*, *the glory of Athens*, *the primum frigidum*, and the Pythagorean essays *On the Use of Meat*. All these he justly refers to the early years of Plutarch, and his declamations at Rome.

[2] *Sympos.*, viii, 7. 3.

however that may be, all our other evidence tells us that men, at least in those days, were very free from the grovelling fears and miseries here attributed to them by Plutarch. The belief in future happiness is gravely adopted by him, in spite of sceptical objections, in the *Consolations* he addressed to Apollonius[1] and to his wife on the loss of their children; and as future bliss seems to imply future pain, it is very strange that nothing of the kind is held out as a danger to the deliberate atheist, who is, moreover, frequently the superstitious man tormented out of all belief!

But enough of this. The critics who adopt Plutarch's argument as based on fact must also assert a recovery of ceremonial religion among the men of that generation, and this they support by his statement that the oracle at Delphi, of late fallen into total decay, had revived its activity, and was in Plutarch's day again frequently consulted. They may now also cite an inscription found by Lolling on the peninsula of Methone, and belonging to the obscure town of Korope, which possessed an oracle of Apollo Koropaeus. The inscription provides in great detail for the appointment of officers to take charge of the sanctuary, to receive the enquiries and issue the reponses in due order, and to plant with trees and protect from trespass the sacred enclosure. The distinct reason given is the benefit derived from the god through the many strangers who now visit the place.[2] Even if Lolling has rightly fixed the date of this interesting document as the first century B. C.,[1] it is but a partial corroboration; and I hesitate to adopt so strange an inference about religion generally from a solitary passage in a treatise which is throughout an *apologia* for the decay of faith. Plutarch, indeed, takes personal credit for having restored and beautified Pylæa (the suburb of Delphi where the Pythian games were held), with the help of two friends and of the governor of Delphi—probably a great aid to his own popularity; but this indicates no general revival of belief in oracles throughout the Greek world. Gradually the great shrine had gone down in estimation; the priests had no longer the position and wide knowledge of their predecessors; the Pythia was a common peasant, who talked in vulgar prose; the subjects of enquiry were domestic and trivial, only fit, he says, to be answered in common language: "Am I to marry, to sail, to invest money?" or, in the case of cities, questions about their crops, their cattle, and their sanitation.[2] And yet for all these changes Plutarch ingeniously finds natural causes, which should content men with this decadence, just as he exhorts them to acquiesce in their political decay. And here I note as remarkable that the development of religion in Greece brought down the conception of providential interference to the trivial affairs of everyday life, whereas our modern tendency is exactly the reverse. We now hesitate even to pray for rain or fair weather, as our fathers did, but, as it were, restrict the domain of Providence to grave moral affairs.

---

[1] The genuineness of this tract is disputed by Volkmann, but I think needlessly.

[2] *Ath. Mitth.*, Vol. VII, pp. 71 *sq.;* cf. Lucian, *Alex.*, 53.

---

[1] This is his correction in the second article (cf. *ibid.*, Vol. VII, p. 340).

[2] *De Pyth.*, 28.

There is much that is reasonable, much that is eloquent, in the Pythian treatise; and yet what can be more singular, what more melancholy, than to see the sage clinging to the sinking ship, or rather trying to stop the leak, and declare her seaworthy, while in his own country, as well as through the Hellenistic East, there had lately been preached a new faith which he never took pains to understand? He can tell us how the Jewish high-priest was clothed, but even on Jewish dogmas he manifests the grossest ignorance.[1] His collection of the *placita* of philosophers is superficial and jejune; his studies in comparative religion, though his theory asserted the equal dignity and veracity of all religions, are even more superficial and careless; he professed himself a cosmopolitan thinker; he was really a narrow and bigoted Hellene, as narrow and exclusive as the old opponents of Alexander had been in their day. This ingrained bigotry was the real secret of the decay and downfall of Greece. While the Asiatic cities had learned at least something from contact with the East, Greece had remained behind, had become poor and depopulated, stagnant in thought as well as in active life. There is no more signal instance of this stagnation than the sayings and counsels of Plutarch on politics and on religion.

The same may be said of his utterances on art. No new production of any merit is mentioned; old statues, old temples, old pictures, were still prized. People went to be shown round Delphi by chattering cicerones; they frequented picture galleries; they admired the bloom on ancient bronzes,[1] the splendour of Homer and Pindar, the music of the ancients, which was no longer understood. On these things Plutarch copies Plato or Aristoxenus. But though statues were set up in crowds to benefactors of their several cities, we hear that these monuments of liberality were kept in stock, often without the heads, which were added when the dedication was ascertained and the statue bought; and even this was more tolerable than the practice, above mentioned (p. 278), of erasing old dedications and renaming the effigies of ancient gods and heroes.

---

[1] Cf. *Symph.*, iv, qu. 6, *On the God of the Jews.* This ignorance seems to prove that the many Jews now at Athens, Corinth, and elsewhere through Greece never mixed in good Greek society.

Let us then turn to the only life still remaining—the private and domestic doings of Plutarch's friends.

---

[1] No setting of a dialogue was ever more appropriate or promising than that of Plutarch *On the Pythian Oracle*. A party of visitors are being led round by the professional showmen, whom they ridicule while they follow them, interrupting their follies with serious talk on religion and art. As usual in Greek literature, the splendid natural features of the place are never mentioned. The openings of the first seventeen chapters contain interesting allusions to old treasure-houses and the offerings they contained. The habit of visiting picture galleries is clearly implied by the opening sentence of the tract *On the Genius of Socrates*. An artist compares the visits of ignorant visitors to his gallery (*οἱ θεώμενοι τοὺς γεγραμμένους πίνακας*) to the confused applause of a crowd, those of the cultivated and critical to acquaintances who individually address him.

CHAPTER XV

PLUTARCH AND HIS TIMES—PRIVATE LIFE

No generation of men ever felt more keenly than Plutarch's contemporaries that they represented the old age of their country. Not only is there no outlook before them, but, when discussing the treatment and education of the child, we find Plutarch dealing with the various efforts to overcome the constitutional delicacies derived from unhealthy parents, a difficulty which earlier theorists would have met with a far more trenchant solution. Exposing of children was still perhaps as common as of old, but now they were exposed from poverty;[1] while Plutarch's wealthy friends, however unfit to be parents, never reflected upon the sin of spreading hereditary disease among their race. There were even medical courses of treatment, intended to protect children from the probable outbreak of such diseases. Plutarch uses all this as an illustration of his principle that the apparent delays of divine justice are only larger and deeper justice, and considers that the "skipping of generations" so often noticeable in gout and other punitive diseases arises from the insight of the Deity into the virtues of those that are spared.[2]

---

[1] οἱ μὲν γὰρ πένητες οὐ τρέφουσι τέκνα κ. τ. λ. (*de amore prolis, sub fin.*).

[2] *De sera num. vind.*, 19–22; *de lib. educ.*, 3, and Suet., *Tib.*, 2. If this tract be genuine, he knows that drunken parents produce drunkards. In Philo (*Leg. ad Caium*, 8) there is a remarkable argument put in Caligula's mouth, that his ancestors were his educators in imperial qualities, in that they transmitted them to him in his blood.

considering the treatment of children, he sets himstrongly against that selfish luxury in parents which ses them to neglect personal supervision. There may be, indeed, excessive and injurious forcing of children—a very modern vice in parents—but this is not so usual as its opposite.[1] Beginning with the duty of the mother to nurse her own child—which, by the way, his own wife did not perform—he inveighs against the crime of economising by the selection of cheap or broken-down slaves to look after the children;[2] still more against the crime of allowing private interest or the thoughtless recommendation of friends to influence the parents' choice of teachers.[3] He seems to feel all through—in this perhaps reflecting the influence of Roman habits on Greek fashion—that education is no longer a state affair, but the private duty of parents. There is hardly a word, in his instructions, upon schools and schooling. But he alludes casually to the strange scenes which boys were allowed to witness—criminals dressed up with robes and crowns, and presently stripped and publicly tortured; objectionable paintings. On the other hand, deportment was strictly watched: for example, not to use the left hand[4] unless it were to hold bread at dinner, while other food was taken with the right; to walk in the streets without looking up; to touch salt-fish with one finger, fresh-fish, bread, meat, with two; *to scratch yourself thus;* to fold your cloak thus.[1] Not only is the necessity of early education insisted upon, but even of a library of standard books for the boy to know and enjoy. Plutarch also expresses the old Greek contempt for the man of late or of self-education. If in our day science, which can be learned in mature life, were not taken into account, we should probably hold very similar views, for classical culture requires early and long schooling.[2]

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 13, and cf. Martial's *aestate pueri si valeat, satis discunt*, x, 62.

[2] If a nurse be employed, let her be a Greek with a good accent (*op. cit.*, 5); on the quality of the pædagogue slave, see cap. 7.

[3] *De falso pudore.*

[4] Cf., on the impoliteness of using the left hand, *de tranq.*, 5; Theodorus' remark, *de fortuna*, 5; *Virt. doceri posse*, 3; cf. Cat., xii, 47. 1.

If you complain that all this instruction costs more time and money than the poor can afford, Plutarch admits it, but says he is only concerned with the more refined classes.

> But some one may object that I, undertaking to give prescriptions on the training of the children of free citizens, apparently neglect the training of poor townsmen, and think only of instructing the rich—to which the obvious answer is: that I should desire the training I prescribe to be attainable alike by all; but if any, through want of private means, cannot obtain it, let them blame their fortune and not their adviser. Every effort, then, must be made, even by the poor, to train their children in the best possible way, and if this is beyond them, to do it according to their means.[3]

This remark is more particularly applicable to bodily training, on which the age had attained to far greater wisdom and more modern common-sense than we should have expected. In the first place, Plutarch sets himself against any iron rules which make a man the slave of his body, and purchase health at the cost of accepting idleness and stupidity along with it. Thus the rule of the trainers that men should not excite themselves with talk at meals he rejects as probably wrong, and in any case socially inexpedient. Even special diet is bad, and so are all extremes, such as the ostentation[1] of taking cold baths. Whatever is not natural he regards as unhealthy; and not only does he speak with the greatest disgust and contempt of the habit of taking emetics, but he puts purgatives in the same category, as being quite superfluous to those who live a regular and temperate life, and as being only invented to relieve excess.[2] Still he is human enough to admit, in the mouth of his leading character in the dialogue, that it is not easy to maintain strict moderation at a large and sumptuous feast, where refusing many things is not polite.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 9.

[2] Cf. *Symp.*, ix, 14. 3, where ὀψιμαθὲς and ἄγροικον are coupled together.

[3] *De lib. educ.*, 11; cf. also *de san. præc.*, 25.

> You should prepare for such occasions by abstemiousness beforehand. But if you be really indisposed, it is a case of false shame to accept such invitations, when a properly worded excuse *with a smart point in it* will often please as much as an acceptance. A similar defence of your abstemiousness at table will often help you easily out of the difficulty.

Like all later authorities, he prefers field sports and general military training to athletic competitions.

There is little to be gleaned, as I have said before, concerning school life; the later education of the youth now consisted chiefly in hearing lectures and practising rhetoric or disputation, as an introduction either to practical life or that higher calling known as philosophy. He seems to attach but little importance to those *ephebic* institutions which played so prominent a part in the Hellenistic days of Athens.[1] Plutarch is very emphatic on the proper mental attitude for the youthful hearers of lectures, readers of poets, and students of art, both as regards the matter brought before them and the person of the teacher. Great care must be taken to separate the mere art side in dramatic poetry and in painting from the ethical. If they see representations of violent or indecent passion, they must only attend to the talent of the drawing. And as regards the quality of the teachers, the mere exhibiting Sophist is very different from the solid philosopher, who probes our faults, and gives us serious and stern advice:

---

[1] *ἐπιδεικτικὸν καὶ νεανικόν*, *San. præc.*, 15.

[2] *μιαρὰ παραμύθια πλησμονῆς* (the loathsome solace of surfeiting), *op. cit.*, 20.

> And you must not be like the many who delight in and applaud him so long as he talks of things indifferent; but whenever he comes to home questions and takes men to task individually, get angry and think him intrusive; for they naturally assume that hearing philosophers in the schools is much the same as hearing actors in the theatre—people who differ in no wise from themselves in their private lives. Now this is true enough as regards the Sophists, who, when they leave their professional chair and lay aside their books, are in the affairs of life insignificant and on a level with the many. But as regards real philosophers, we ignore that both their earnest and their sport, their smile and their frown, and, most of all, their advice to each man in private, bear precious fruit to those who will accustom themselves to attend to them.[2]

---

[1] Inscriptions indeed of such bodies still abound, and we have from the opening of the second century (111, 130 A. D., etc.) onward a most interesting series of the busts of the Athenian *cosmetæ*, or controllers of the *ephebi*. The great contrasts in the appearance, and the often non-Hellenic types, of these men, who were at least socially of the highest class, are a plain indication how cosmopolitan even Attic society, with all its conservative tendencies, had now become (cf. the busts reproduced by A. Dumont in *BCH.*, Vols. I and II, with his article, Vol. I, p. 229).

[2] *De rect. rat. aud.*, 12.

in public. Nor does Plut
age, confine himself to h
Whether Cynics, or Stoics,
most frequent, Eclectics—
and acknowledged virtues w
contentions than, for exam
testants exhibit; disputing
on special points of doctri
broad general lines, and all s
knowing and teaching practi
derides the paradoxes of the
promising temper was consti
trenchant attitude; but how
adopt from them? His profe
original Academy, was Plato,
on married life show that the
appeared to him, not only in
inhuman. He desires no her
great reform in society, but n
the basis of

so far as to study geometry and Plato, but on no account allow religious cults foreign to her husband to creep into the house.[1] He censures the cruelties of a hot-tempered house-master, the miseries of a superstitious one—all the petty weaknesses and vices that attack every over-ripe and decaying society are pictured in his pages.

But what remedies does he propose? Not the revelation of any mystery, not the ardent love of a new creed, not the uncompromising courage of a Stoic principle. He borrows from the cold Aristotle the doctrine of habit, of gradual progress in virtue, of gradual falling away into vice, and exhorts his hearers to watch small things, to begin with small resolves, to practise "active habits of virtue," and so train themselves gradually to self-control, good temper, liberality, calmness of mind. There is not even any bold denunciation of the grave immoralities which permeated Greek society. He inveighs, indeed, against the new and extravagant terms of praise uttered by the audiences in lecture-rooms, because here there is excess.[2] He cannot endure the poet Aristophanes, for, in the first place, he says: "If you recite him at a feast, each guest must have a grammarian beside him to explain the allusions; and then how coarse he is, and obscene, and how little he studies the proper diction of his various characters." But on the splendours of the poet—his unequalled richness of humour, his exquisite style, his lyric sweetness—not a word. Every eulogy is reserved for Menander, the only poet (beside Euripides) worth reciting in society, the most perfect outcome of Greek literature, the most perfect mirror of human life.[1] Let the reader turn to my *Greek Life and Thought*,[2] where I have weighed the Attic New Comedy in the scale of morals. He will be persuaded that a more mesquin and frivolous society has never been brought upon the stage. But Menander and his society were polished; there was nothing raw or harsh about them; their vices were venial, or at least curable; they went through their lives without any offensive tragedy or any vulgar suicide.

---

[1] This is probably pointed at Christianity, as well as at those oriental cults which we know to have done domestic mischief in those days.

[2] *De rect. rat. aud.*, 15: "Those who have brought in the fashion of new exclamations of lectures, such as *divine*, *inspired*, *unapproachable* (θείως, θεοφορήτως, ἀπροσίτως), instead of the old καλῶς, σοφῶς, or ἀληθῶς, behave with great indecency, and damage the lecturer by suggesting that he desires such extravagant eulogy."

This, then, is really Plutarch's mission—apart from his work as a biographer—to feel the pulse of society, to give ordinary rules and advices, to make human intercourse smoother and more agreeable. Here it is that all those qualities which make his philosophy superficial and his morals feeble aid him to direct social life with tact and give entertainments with refinement. This is, therefore, a topic worthy of special attention; for here, if anywhere, the Greeks were still acknowledged masters, and gave the tone to all the society of the civilised world.

Indeed, we may pass almost naturally from the philosophic lectures, which we have just mentioned, to the question of conversation, for the whole tract *On Proper Conduct at Lectures* is partly moral, partly social in its tone. All through it he feels that the danger of his age was over-attention to words, to form, to purity and grace of diction, with neglect of the real substance.

---

[1] Even Euripides and Pindar he charges with the vulgarities of boastfulness and conceit (*On Self-praise*, 1).

[2] Pp. 115–23.

> Wherefore we should imitate, not the flower-girl, but the bee, in seeking for the essence. For the former gathers rich and scented flowers, and weaves them into garlands sweet indeed, but ephemeral and fruitless; whereas the bee, after flying through meadows of violas and roses and hyacinths, lights upon the strongest and most pungent thyme, and hence obtains what is best for its honey.

The showy flowers of the field are therefore the food of drones, just as the phrases and periods of the Sophist satisfy vulgar hearers. "Nay, rather as a man about to leave the barber's shop stands up before the looking-glass, and feels his head, and notes the change in the cut of his hair and beard," so he that stands up to leave a lecture-room should examine his mind and see what he has gained.[1]

Nevertheless, *form* is a delightful thing, and young men are quite right to admire it. But remember that nothing is worse than that critical attitude which cannot praise without some carping or detraction; here you must observe the mean[2] between the gushing and the sneering hearer. But the admiration of form should come after the serious matters.

> Just as those at a feast, when their thirst is allayed, then begin to look at the plate and turn the cups in their hands, so when the hearer is well fed with dogmas, he may consider what elegance there is in the exposition. But he that from the outset does not hold to the substance, but requires the diction to be Attic and chaste,[3] is like the man who will not drink an antidote

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, 13.

[3] Cf. also *de profect.*, 8. It is remarkable that he ridicules (*de vit. pud.*, 16) as pedantic the avoidance of *hiatus* in composition, a law carefully attended to by most Attic writers, *and indeed apparently*

…ounders to reproduce
Sophists and their heare
that, with the qualified
muster till he fell into tl
even approximated to Att

by himself. I will here say
accepted, since the famous t
Plutarchean collection. Volkn
his exhaustive work (*Leben, Sch*
Berlin, 1869), endeavours to sho
reasons support this external
Moralia hiatus is admitted, he
spuriousness. But here, as else
subjective convictions taking tl
Consolatio ad Apollonium is juc
bach and Bähr to be excellent, a
the verge of tragedy (*op. cit.*, V
144), frigid and strained, overlac
cannot but feel that he was led l
and that, had the *Consolation* a
escaped his censure. And what a
doubtful? Thus the tract *de ga*
but has nevertheless so many g
Benseler pause. But Volkmar
emendation, apologises for the re

The whole discussion, theref
suggestive, seems to me to want
and sift a complete
variati

erate in eloquence as were their contemporaries who affected to copy the old philosophic masters by adopting Plato's stoop and Aristotle's lisp.[1] To repeat the fine illustration with which he closes the tract:

> As if one went to seek fire from his neighbour, and, finding it bright and cheery, were to sit down there and stay warming himself, so is he who comes to seek instruction from another and forgets to kindle his own flame, but in delight at what he hears sits soothed with the ruddiness and reflected glow upon his face, and brings home nothing to dissipate the inner darkness and mildew of his soul, or to air it with philosophy.

Perhaps these things are but splendid commonplaces; what is not so is the demand of Plutarch, himself a lecturer, for the warm and even undisguised sympathy of his audience. He expects attentive watching of the lecturer, an upright sitting posture, and a countenance beaming with interest at what is said. Such conduct as sprawling on the benches, assuming a negligent attitude, whispering to one's neighbour, yawning, giggling, is censured as a social crime.

> For some think the speaker only has duties and the hearers none; that he must come well prepared and full of thoughts, but that they without any consideration are to sit down as to a feast which they enjoy at the cost of another's labour. Yet as surely as good company is necessary to the feast, so is a good hearer to the lecture; for barbarisms and solecisms are quite as possible in the audience as in the speaker.[2]

But if Plutarch makes these demands upon the audience at a discourse, he is even more exacting when he discusses society proper and social entertainments. Then as now, dinner parties at which ladies were sometimes present, and wine parties of men, were the prevalent occasions for such gatherings. It was the habit, he tells us, at Sybaris, to send out invitations with a year's notice, in order that the ladies might have time to prepare a splendid toilette.[1] As far as the internal preparation of the guests is concerned, a year is no notice; it is the whole education of the man which comes out in his social intercourse.

---

[1] *De aud. poet.*, 59: ὥσπερ οἱ τὴν Πλάτωνος ἀπομιμούμενοι κυρτότητα, καὶ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους τραυλότητα, a phrase he repeats elsewhere.

[2] *Ibid.*, 13, 14.

> For the guest does not go in like a vessel to be filled, but with a mind to give and take, in earnest and in jest, for which this is the proper opportunity. And be it remembered that it is easy to decline a dish if it be ill-cooked, or take to water if the wine be bad, but a *table-mate*[2] who gives you a headache or makes you ill destroys all the pleasures of wines or dainties or music; nor can you send away from the table this source of disgust, which often produces lifelong dislikes, as it were the after-taste[3] of the unpleasantnesses which occurred at table. Hence Chilon, invited yesterday, was quite right in saying that he would not come until he heard who were to be the company; in war or on sea voyages you must submit to an unpleasant comrade; to do so in society is folly.[4]

The host, having taken precautions concerning this matter (which, indeed, was not so easy as it now is, seeing that guests often brought friends who were strangers to him), is next bound to see that there is ample room for all, the crowding of a table in any sense being quite inexcusable. Large dinner parties of twenty-five or thirty were hardly ever successful, as the conversation, which ought to be general, then breaks up into private dialogues;[1] and as the dining-rooms of Greek houses were comparatively small, such feasts generally implied very tight fitting of the guests, which Plutarch condemns. "Should by any accident the food or wine run short, it is easy to say, I am very sorry, but the servants have made away with it; whereas such a polite excuse (!) is impossible in the case of room, over which the master has absolute control." He introduces his eighth query in the eighth book of his *Table-Talk* by saying that they avoided the large and mixed parties given at the Isthmian games by Sospis, when president of the feast and keeping open house for both citizens and guests; but he afterwards praises[2] the banquet given by the wealthy Ammonius, strategus of Athens, after an examination of the ephebi at the Diogeneion. I may add that at the select party given by the former a schoolmaster (γραμματικός) and a cicerone (περιηγητής) figured as guests—certainly not an aristocratic pair in any modern or in a Roman sense; indeed, Plutarch introduces the self-conscious vanity of the former as part of the scene;[3] the man was silent and sulky because he had not gained applause in a public display. Physicians play a leading part in Plutarch's society, and evidently enjoyed a good social position now as heretofore in Greece.[4] But the whole society at Ammonius' house is distinctly *professional*—rhetoricians, gymnastic trainers, farmers; not a single *grandee* or person living idly from his estates can be found among them. The few Romans, like Sossius Senecio, who actually take part in the discussions, may perhaps count as exceptions.

---

[1] They are not yet quite so extravagant in London, though I have often received an invitation to dine six weeks later in that city.

[2] It is a scandalous thing that the English language has no proper word for *σύνδειπνος*, the French *convive*.

[3] "Hot-coppers," the German *Katzenjammer*, would be even more literal for *ἑωλοκρασία*, as used in this connection.

[4] *Sept. sap. conv.*, 2.

---

[1] v, 5. [2] ix, 1. [3] *Symp.*, ix, 5.

[4] Cf. Hertzberg's learned note, Vol. II, pp. 174, 175.

Simple appointments and a short *menu* are commended,[1] as the whole feast turns upon the mental qualities of the company. But we may note that the absence of an old and wealthy aristocracy, with splendid heirlooms in plate and pictures, with princely residences of long tradition, makes Plutarch underrate the external setting of a dinner party. The only splendour which he knows is that of the *nouveau riche*, the vulgar upstart, the imitator of the state of Hellenistic courts. This absence of an aristocracy, with recognised titles and precedence in society, seems to have also increased the difficulty of placing the guests at table, for the jealousies of human nature, which are universal, were not tempered, as they are in modern Europe by grades of dignity universally recognised. Plutarch insists in many places on the truly democratic nature of social converse, where all should affect, if they do not feel, equality. He even regards it as "oligarchical and offensive" to come late, "democratical and polite" to be in good time.[2] But the proper placing of the guests seems to him a task in strategy, no less than to manœuvre a phalanx. He even illustrates it, not without an apology, by the instance of the Divine architect ordering the world from chaos, not adding or destroying one particle of matter, but merely putting each element in its right place.

---

[1] His notions of wicked luxury are curiously subjective—snow for cooling drinks, the straining of wine, the use of wether mutton and ox-beef (instead of rams and bulls), the making fowl tender by artificial processes, the fattening of geese for their livers, and many other of the ordinary devices of civilisation are censured (*Symp.*, vi, *passim*). Nevertheless the art of cooking, even in Greece, had reached an advanced stage (cf. iv, 1. 2).

[2] *Symp.*, viii, 6. 2.

The discussion which follows[1] is as instructive to-day as it was in the first century. If you make distinctions and fix places, you are sure to cause offence. If you let things take their course, you will have a random result, in which wrong people are sure to get together, and fail to enjoy themselves. Plutarch's general solution is to abandon ceremony as to rank, to hold to the democratic aspect of the feast, but to take great care about having suitable people to sit together. And this is not easy, seeing that likeness of character is sometimes a cause of conflict, as with gamecocks; sometimes a cause of friendly consorting, as with jackdaws. There are some that drink too much wine, and some water-drinkers;[2] some old men with their conceit, some young with their folly.

> I advise then not to set the rich by the rich, or the young by the young, or the magistrate beside his colleague, or two intimates together; for so the conversation will have no general activity; but rather the eager learner beside the distinguished scholar, the benign beside the peevish, the ingenuous youth beside the vain old talker, the reserved beside the boaster, the silent beside the passionate; and if you have a lavish *richard*, draw from the obsure corner some worthy poor man, on the chance of the full cup overflowing into his empty vessel. But don't put a Sophist beside a Sophist, or a poet beside a poet; separate also the captious and the litigious, inserting some sort of buffer between them. Whereas I should bring together athletic people and sportsmen and farmers, so also those fond of drinking and the amorous, not merely those who have fallen in

[1] *Op. cit.*, i, 2.

[2] *Ibid.*, vi, 4.

love, but those given to wine and women; for men warmed at the same fire more readily consort, provided, by Jove, that they are not in pursuit of the same person.

He recognises, moreover, what we call *grouting* at a party. All the company need not be brilliant; for as we mix water with wine to temper its strength, and as consonants are necessary between the sonants (vowels), so are silent but well-disposed listeners.[1] The established custom that ladies should sit by their husbands and boys beside their parents solved that side of the difficulty.

He proceeds to discuss whether the old fashion, then exploded, of having a regular *symposiarch*, a master of the feast, was or was not of advantage. There was much to be said on both sides, but here again it seems to me that Hellenistic society required more controlling than ours, seeing that display and forwardness were certainly more common than they are with us northerners. This we may infer from a passage[2] in which he apprehends that without regulation the *symposium* will become in turn a democratic assembly, a Sophist's school, a gambling-house, or a scenic stage—such was the taste for display in oratory, recitation, acting.[3] A governor of the feast will have to vary the entertainment, and as they say that a walk along the sea and a sail along the land are the pleasantest, so he must combine earnest and jest.

The *Table-Talk* left us by our author gives a large assortment of the topics suitable for agreeable conversation. Any one who examines them will see how easy it is to frame theories, and how hard to satisfy practical requirements in detail. Modern and sensible as are his views, there are few of the questions raised which are not either silly, trivial, or even shocking in their naturalism to modern refinement. Here are some specimens: Why are men more greedy towards the end of autumn? Which came first: a hen or an egg? Why is *a* the first letter of the alphabet? Why is the tear of a wild boar sweet, while that of a stag is salt?—a charming enquiry![1] Whether philosophers should wear garlands at a feast? And yet he thinks it vulgar to talk about a feast one has enjoyed, or a procession, or to tell a dream, or a personal dispute one has had.[2] Nay, he even thinks an account of one's travels rather dull and second-rate.[3]

---

[1] *Symp.*, i, 1. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*, i, 4. 3.

[3] The habit of recitations in Greek had lately (he says) come into fashion at Rome, in his own day, and he discusses (*Symp.*, vii, 8) what authors are fit for this purpose. He protests against Plato's dialogues being paraded at a dinner table, but says elsewhere (*ibid.*, 5. 4) that Euripides, Pindar, and Menander, especially the last, are more suitable.

Perhaps the best of all his advices is that on the proper questions to ask so that the guests may display their knowledge, and have the pleasure of doing so; and again, what exact place jokes and sarcasms should have in a conversation; when they will amuse without doing damage, and when they will ruffle the temper of the "table-mates." Here is an abstract of this discussion,[4] which is too long for quotation. I shall weave in some similar passages.

He opens his eighth book by saying that to expel philosophy from feasts is worse than putting out the light;

---

[1] I can but refer to iii, 6, *περὶ καιροῦ συνουσίας*.

[2] *De rect. rat. aud.*, 3.

[3] Nevertheless the two travellers whom he introduces at the opening of the tract *On the Decay of the Oracles* are among the most interesting figures he draws.

[4] *Symp.*, ii, 1.

[illegible] of eating in she
whereas to take no care
the discourse is to serve
and unprepared, so that
This reverts to the old a
spontaneity has little to
phase the result of caref
very important to put suc
temper and ready conve
people like to be asked
company do not know, an
make known. Thus thos
land and sea like to be a
or perilous sea, or barbaria
and describe them, accept
for all their previous toil.
we are anxious to talk abo
to be asked to tell, thinkin
doing what we can hardly
when it is a bore.[2] This is

whereas refined people like to be asked to tell what they want to tell, but are ashamed to volunteer, from regard to their company; as, for example, their own successes and achievements—such as in embassies and politics.[1] Accordingly, jealous and ill-natured people avoid such questions, and turn off the conversation so as to keep it from leading up naturally to such subjects, and rather take up what a man's adversaries would like to hear. Avoid therefore allusions to misfortunes, such as the loss of a suit at law, the death of a child, or disasters in trade by sea and land.

Here, on the contrary, are agreeable topics. Men delight in being repeatedly questioned about their success in a harangue, or how they were addressed by the king, or how they escaped storms or pirates, while their fellows were caught; for they seem to enjoy the thing all over again in telling it. They like also to be asked about their children's progress in learning, and about their own intercourse or intimacy with princes. The misfortunes of their enemies, too, they delight in telling, when they are asked, but avoid volunteering on this subject, as it seems like spite. So you should ask a sportsman about dogs, an athlete about contests, an amorous man about beauty. But the pious man, who is given to sacrifices, and likes talking of dreams, and how he made a hit by observing omens or victims, or by the favour of the gods, should be questioned accordingly. Old people, too, though they may have nothing to say, are always pleased and set going by questions, while those who curtail their conversation, and want mere categorical answers, take away the chief pleasure which the old have in society. To sum up: If you desire to be agreeable, ask questions for which the answerer will gain, not blame, but approval; not dislike, but good-will, from the company. I will add that in another place[1] he comments on the gross impoliteness of answering a question addressed to another without waiting for his reply. It implies that he does not know, or that you know better, and says to the questioner: "Why did you ask another, when I was present?" Ofttimes, too, the question was not intended to elicit information, but merely to draw a silent or modest man into the conversation and make him feel at home. All this the chatterbox upsets by his meddlesome forwardness. Many of these points are illustrated from Homer, whose poems were to Plutarch, as to all the literary Greeks of that age, a mine, not only of philosophy and religion, but of good manners.

---

[1] Further examples of long-winded stories are given, *de garr.*, 21, 22; cf. Theophrastus' tract *On Garrulity*.

There follows a long discussion on the expediency of wit or ridicule, and the great dangers of its indiscriminate use. This enquiry has its Latin parallel in Cicero's study of the same subject from the orator's point of view in the second book of his treatise *de oratore*. Plutarch sees clearly that ridicule is disguised censure, and that a jibe, like a barbed dart, will stick faster and hurt more than a serious reproof. Moreover, the laughter of the company is taken as assent and approval of the censure, and fills the object of it with spite against them. To joke, therefore, without hurting requires no ordinary experience and tact. If your ridicule touches a serious defect, acknowledged or even commonly suspected in its object, then harm and hurt will ensue; whereas if it be ostentatiously false, or even suggests the opposite virtue, it is pleasant. You may joke a water-drinker about going home drunk, or a millionaire about his creditors, or a beauty about his plain looks; but you must not congratulate a thief on his honesty, or on having his hand in his own pocket—to use a modern phrase. The most agreeable praise is often suggested by its manifest contradiction. Thus the bitterness of a joke is removed by the joker being himself the joint object of it, as when a poor man ridicules poverty, or a low-born man low birth. In this way the harper stopped King Philip from displaying his amateur criticisms;[1] for when lectured by the king upon chords and harmonies, he replied: "I pray heaven, O King, you may never come down so far in the world as to understand these things better than I do."

---

[1] *De garr.*, 19.

Of all subjects, that of love is here, as in all other respects, incommensurable; for some like being chaffed about it, while others get angry, so that you must study the particular case. For as fire can be extinguished at the outset by the blast which afterwards feeds it, so a budding passion resents being made public, whereas when once declared it is fed by allusions and receives them with laughter. You may, moreover, ridicule a lover about his passion in the presence of his beloved, but about nothing else. So those who happen to be in love with their own wives glory in being ridiculed about it when the ladies are present. Finally, let us remember that smart and biting words are justifiable as repartees, when a man is attacked and on his defence, which are inexcusable if he volunteered them without provocation.[1]

---

[1] τὴν ὀψιμαθίαν ἅμα καὶ περιεργίαν, *Conviv. quæst.* (ii, 1. 12), and Theophrastus' tracts with these titles.

In all these social advices regard must be had to the varying intimacy of the guests with the host and with one another. These conditions range from the relative or the family friend—who should talk with kindly familiarity to the trusty slaves, interest himself in the wife's troubles, offer mediation in family disputes, carry about the children like his own—to the almost stranger, who had not even a direct invitation, but came as the companion or *umbra* of another guest.[2] There is a whole chapter on the propriety of bringing such secondary guests, or of accepting such secondary invitations from guests. Plutarch apparently decides that you must allow people to take this liberty, as it is an established fashion,[3] but that he will never go out himself on these terms. Moreover, if it prevail, you transfer your party into the hands of others, and may have your table unduly crowded with unsuitable guests.[4] On the other side it is urged that if it be grossly vulgar to enquire beforehand from the guests what they like to eat, and what wine and unguents they prefer, it is not so to secure the most pleasant company they can have by letting them bring some of their best friends. And the conclusion is just as we should draw it: in cases of great intimacy, and of a small party, where there are special social reasons, such a fashion is not only harmless, but often a great help to make an evening pleasant.

---

[1] *Reip. ger. præc.*, 7.

[2] *Conv. quæst.*, vii, 6. 1: τὸ τῶν ἐπικλήτων ἔθος νῦν Σκιὰς καλοῦσι.

[3] διὸ καλῶν μὲν ἑτέρους ἔδωκά ποτε σκιάς, ἰσχυρὰ γὰρ ἡ τῆς πόλεως (apparently Delphi) συνήθεια καὶ δυσπαραίτητος (vii, 6. 2).

[4] One hears nowadays that in London certain august personages send beforehand to the host a list of the persons they desire to meet, and this, too, without having the sense to enquire whether the guests they thus inflict upon their host are on good terms with him or with each other.

I turn from these details, which are only samples of the harvest to be gathered from Plutarch's works, to a general estimate of the society which he represents.

It is, as I said before, strikingly modern in most respects, even over-ripe, and tending towards decay from over-refinement; and yet we are frequently pulled up by something quite foreign to modern culture, something to us highly indecent, or else some moral judgment singularly lax for a very sound and religious mind, reflecting the highest and purest feelings of that society and that age. Yet there was in them no lack of moral dignity, no want of lofty claims. He exclaims:

> Will not the good man consider every day a festival, and a splendid one too, if he has reasonable aspirations? For the world is the most august of temples, and most worthy of its Lord; into this temple man is introduced at his birth, into the presence, not of statues made with hands and motionless, but such as the Divine mind has manifested to our senses, copies of what is spiritual, as Plato said, having in them the principle of life and motion — even the sun, moon, and stars, and the rivers ever pouring forth fresh water, and the earth producing food for plants and animals. As this life, then, is the most perfect of initiations into the most exalted of mysteries, we should ever be filled with cheerfulness and joy; not like the crowd that frequent the Kronia and Panathenæa, or other such feasts, that they may for a day enjoy purchased laughter from actors and dancers. But let us rather take our places reverently and with fair words; for no man may lament at his initiation into the Mysteries, nor does he weep at the Pythian games. Yet do men violate these mysteries which God has provided for them, living constantly in lamentation and dejection and weary anxiety. And while they delight in sweet music, and singing-birds, and

> cattle sporting in the fields, but are annoyed at their howling and bellowing, nevertheless, seeing their own life joyless and troubled, weighed down with endless griefs and cares, they will neither seek a remedy in themselves, nor receive from the philosopher the true medicine for their souls.[1]

The duties of charity, of gentleness, of truthfulness, are rather deduced from this lofty view of the dignity of our nature, and what it demands, than from the dictates of a moral law or the obligations of duty.

Yet it might fairly have been argued by the Christian apologists, who were just about to arise in this society, that these philosophies had not shown the power of purifying the soul from its baser passions. I have above (p. 165) quoted a statement to show how little the sanctity of oaths was respected, and what shameful demands were made from friends to support friends by their testimony. What shall we say of Plutarch's sentiment as regards chastity? First of all, he regards the adultery of a wife as an annoyance to be borne by the philosophic husband without losing his temper! "How can you call anything a misfortune which does not damage either your soul or your body, as, for example, the low origin of your father, the adultery of your wife, the loss of a crown or seat of honour, none of which a man requires for the highest condition of body and mind!"[2] Again: "Are you childless? Reflect that up to this date not a single Roman emperor has left a son to succeed him.[3] Are you poor? Who was greater than Epaminondas, and yet he was poor? Has your wife gone astray? Don't you know that Agis, one of the greatest Lacedæmonian kings, had a wife who boasted among her maids that her child was by Alcibiades?”[1] And Plutarch calls it one of the follies of prying curiosity that, in addition to a man’s intemperance, he commits the absurdity of passing by common and public women, and following after one who is rich and guarded within her husband’s house. Thus he tells, without any feeling of aversion, how, when the news reached Pergamum that Eumenes had been assassinated at Delphi, his brother, Attalus II, took the diadem of his brother, and “went in unto” his brother’s wife; when the wounded king came home, his brother, with many protestations of affection, handed him back diadem and wife, both of which in the end he received back again by bequest when Eumenes really died.[2] Nowhere, indeed, does Plutarch manifest any deep reprobation for unchastity, even when contrary to nature, if it be not a violation of other people’s rights, or an excess which injures health and activity. The open way in which such topics are discussed is not, however, to be brought as an additional charge against that age, for it is likely that the excessive prudery of some societies has done more harm than this naturalism, which is often consistent with sound moral health.

---

[1] *De tranq.*, 20.

[2] *Ibid.*, 17.

[3] He must then have written these words before Titus succeeded in 79 A. D.

But in other respects also the society of Greece does not appear to us in very fair colours, even through this most favourable medium. I repudiate, indeed, altogether the picture drawn by Hertzberg in his *History*[1] of the shocking features taken from the novels of the day—features rendered impossible by the very virtues which he extracts from Plutarch's and Dion's society. This random setting down of every narrative now extant as equally good evidence is a proceeding saved from ridicule only by the great learning and earnestness of the writer.

---

[1] *De tranq.*, 6.

[2] One of the speakers in his *Amatorius* even goes so far as to say “that there is not a particle of romantic love in the marriage relation, nor will I admit that those affected by women or maidens are in love, any more than a fly is with milk, or a bee with honey, or people with the calves or birds which they fatten for their own use” (§ 4). A second adds (§ 6) that, while many a man has made over his wife or his mistress to another for some large reward, such a case has never been known in the romantic affections which he describes.

But, making all due reservations, there is something vain and self-conscious, not only in the general complexion of the social meetings which Plutarch so carefully describes; there is even some of it in the old man himself, who is evidently proud of his position, his virtues, his reputation; and, though he often alludes to the follies, the loquacity, the conceit, of old age, affords in his own person a specimen, though perhaps a very lovable one, of all these imperfections. There is to me in this, as in every other phase of Greek life which I have studied, a certain want, an absence of the calmness and dignity which we require in the perfect gentleman. Aristotle's disagreeable *grand seigneur*,[2] who ever stands upon his dignity, is as far removed from our ideal as is Plutarch, with his garrulous unreserve. Nor do I imagine that the domestic arrangements of the Greek houses, even the most wealthy, ever attained the real cleanliness which we consider the essence of refinement. The prying man, he tells us,[3] is to avoid looking in at open doors; "for it is not right or fair to the owners, nor is the result pleasant. Within, ill-favoured sights meet the stranger's eye, pots and pans lying in disorder, and women-slaves sitting about, and nothing fine or delightful." It was well if you did not hear the lash, or the outcry of the slaves being punished, or maids upon the rack;[1] an ominous passage, for he couples it with the untidiness to be witnessed about the home of a dissolute man, the ground wet with wine, and the fragments of garlands lying about.[2] No doubt our superior notions regarding these matters are due to the influence of the women of the house.

---

[1] Vol. II, pp. 279 *sq*.

[2] The μεγαλόψυχος (*Nic. eth.*, iv).

[3] *De curios.*, 12.

And yet it is plain that in this age the mistress of the house had at last obtained some of her rights. It was probably in imitation of what they saw in Rome that the richer people in Bœotia and Attica adopted the freer treatment of the sex which they had long noticed, but not copied, at Sparta. Plutarch's wife paid visits and received guests, even when her husband was absent, sat at table with him, and joined in all his public interests. But, nevertheless, his *Conjugal Precepts* make it plain that he regarded all this as a mere concession or toleration on the part of the husband, to which the wife had no claim in the nature of things, just as he enjoins kindness and mercy to slaves, without for one moment disallowing slavery. In fact, the age was mending its manners, little by little, by gradual improvement and gentler habits, just as its moralist is always exhorting the individual to combat his vices by daily resolves and small advances. Such a course of moral hygiene is rational, but has never been really effectual. It requires a new dogma, a great revelation, a startling reform, to carry with it the weak and wavering

---

[1] *De cohib. ira*, 15.

[2] Cf. on an earlier period my *Social Life in Greece*, chap. xi.

among them, full o
Gospel had been pr
Macedonia, in Corintl
Dion, Plutarch, nay, e
his glory." Had Plut
came there, he would h
a respectful hearing,
identity of all religions
Deity, and the right of
or demons in accordan
But no; as Judaism w
vestments of the high-p
everywhere for a mere
his ken.

It is not till the first
Pliny is startled to find i
the altars forgotten, and
province. Even then w
was very little known in G
the Macedonian towns on

Ephesus or Pergamum—which he describes as a scene of passion and of misery.[1] So Dion[2] on his side speaks with a sort of complacency of the decay and disgrace of Athens, and of its vulgar and base imitations of Roman vices—as if the jealous Asianic Hellenist felt that, although the wealth and prosperity of the Asianic towns were now vastly superior, there was still a primacy of sentiment about the name of Athens and of Greece which no *stoas*, or *exedras*, or liberalities from emperors and rich citizens, could supply.

But if there was thus a growing social severance between these large sections of the Greek world, there was also a counteracting influence which tended strongly to produce a deeper unity. This was the widespread worship of deities and cults imported from Egypt and the East, which were foreign to all but Egyptian Greeks, and which therefore caused no local rivalries or jealousies. To supplant one Hellenic god by another or by a Roman god, was no true reformation; the usual expedient was to fuse them into some vague unity—Diana and Artemis, Juno and Hera, Hercules and Heracles. But such expedients could hardly produce spiritual unity of creed. The one bold attempt of the first Ptolemy to import a local Zeus from Sinope and to identify him with a local god near Memphis had been indeed a great success, and a very remarkable piece of ecclesiastical politics.[3] The worship of Serapis spread widely through the Greek world, but not so widely as that of the goddess Isis, who found temples and worshippers not only in the Greek but in the Roman cities.

---

[1] *Whether the Passions of the Soul or of the Body are Worse*, 4.

[2] i, 383, 385.

[3] Cf. my *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 72, for particulars.

Here was a goddess whose cult was as widely popular as is the cult of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Catholic world, and in her worship and that of Serapis, often associated with her, men of wide difference in race and language found a common interest, a feeling of the unity of worship and even unity of creed. Presently the cult of Mithra came in from the East, and this, too, produced a religious revival of its kind—an adherence of many diverse races and societies to one uniform ritual and reverence for the Unseen.[1]

The worship of Augustus, or of the Fortune of Augustus and of Rome, was hardly a spiritual cult, satisfying the hunger of men's souls; it was a political creed, giving expression to the dignity of the Empire. But here, too, a unity of sentiment was clothed in a religious form.

All these tendencies were, as I have said, tendencies towards an empire in religion; not merely a Roman Empire, but a Holy Roman Empire, to use the mediæval phrase. And as the Roman legions were innumerable over the face of the world, but their lord was one, so the legions of local gods came gradually to be understood as legions of angels or demons, carrying out the will of one—the Lord of all.

---

[1] Cf., for full particulars, Professor Dill's chapters on the religion of the Roman Empire at this period.

CHAPTER XVI

EASTERN HELLENISM UNDER THE FLAVIAN HOUSE

Let us then pass once more through the islands to the east, where we can survey with Pliny the economic condition of the cities which Dion had so earnestly exhorted to economy and concord.

We have already noted that Plutarch was essentially a Greek of the Greeks, and so far thoroughly provincial that, despite his early sojourn at Rome, his friendship with a few noble Romans, and his studies in Roman biography, he never mastered Latin, and evidently preferred the sleepy Chæronea to the imperial metropolis. His Hellenism does not even include Asia Minor, but is confined to the old Hellenic centres of culture. And yet, if we had no work of his except his tract *On Exile* surviving, what a thorough cosmopolitan he would appear in the German histories of later Greece! He tells us (§ 5):

> Man is no plant of the soil, but of heavenly origin, and the bounds of the world are his present habitation, nor can any one be an exile or a stranger where there is the same fire, water, air; the same rulers and dispensers of our life, the sun, the moon, and the morning star; the same universal laws of one great system, the winter solstice and the summer, the equinox, the Pleiads, Arcturus, the time of sowing and of growth; moreover, one king and governor, God, in whom is the beginning, the centre, the end of everything, whom Justice attends to punish violations of His law, which rules us all—citizens of the same polity. . . . . Are you forbidden to inhabit Sardis? Neither

does every Athenian or Spartan inhabit the fashionable quarter of his city. We laugh at the man who thought there was a better moon at Athens than at Corinth, and yet, though nature has started us into life free and unshackled, we confine and fetter ourselves within small and shabby limits. For no sooner are we transferred elsewhere than we fret, longing for the Cephissus or the Eurotas, for Taygetus or Parnassus, so making the rest of the world citiless and uninhabitable by our discontent.

All this is very true and fine; but when he proceeds to maintain that life on the barren islands of the Cyclades is, after all, free from all the burdensome duties and expenses of political life, free from all those imperial cares which pursued Tiberius even to an equally barren island, we feel that his eloquence is intended for a particular class—the Roman exiles in the Levant. He takes care, indeed, to address his argument formally to Greeks. "When you enumerate to me heavy taxes, embassies to Rome, receptions of the proconsul, I prefer to live an exile in barren Gyaros or Rocky Cinaros." He goes on to compare Naxos and Hyria with Capri:

And yet these Cyclades were once the home of Codrus' and Neleus' children, far larger than the retreat of Xenophon at Scillus or the Academy which Xenocrates never left but once a year. See, too, in what terms Homer has spoken of many of them. And now they take a man away from the risks of voyage and the tumult of the agora into a steady, leisurely personal existence, circumscribing as with a compass the requirements of his life. For which of these islands has not *a house, a promenade, a bath, fishing and hare-hunting for those who desire that relaxation;*[1] most of all repose, for which others thirst and cannot find even in the seclusion of their homes or their suburban villas and gardens, from which busybodies and sycophants drag them to the court or to the market-place? To your island no busybody or usurer or candidate comes to trouble you, *but from friendship and longing for your society the best of your relations and friends make special voyages to see you.* Compared with this, the state of the man who is ever travelling, and spends his time in hotels and boats, is as inferior as that of a planet to a fixed star. Still more absurd is the case of a man exiled, not to, but from, one place, with all the rest of the earth open to him.

---

[1] So Philo (*Leg. ad Caium*, 43) speaks of those whom Caligula had exiled, τοὺς ἀρίστους καὶ εὐγενεστάτους, ἤδη ζῶντας ὡς ἐν πατρίσι ταῖς νήσοις καὶ τὴν ἀτυχίαν εὐτυχέστατα φέροντας, which, though in a rhetorical speech, must have agreed with current notions as regards this secluded life. I have already noticed this point above, p. 310.

I need not proceed. This rhetorical consolation, which I have already considered, shows a large society upon these islands which it was thought disloyal and perhaps dangerous to name,[1] but of which many might any day return to influence, and who were only too glad to receive visits from their friends, whom they also met at those religious festivals which exiles were permitted to attend. But upon all this there is, unfortunately for us, great reticence. It appears, however, that so long as the seas were safe from pirates, under the efficient government of the Flavians and Antonines, there was more life and society on the islands of the Cyclades than has been suspected by the historians. Let us pass on to Asia Minor.

I have already cited[2] the evidence of Strabo for the prosperity of Asia Minor in general and the fertility of its Hellenistic territories. The picture we can now draw from Dion and from Pliny is not so flattering, either because they chance to give us the reverse side of the same picture, or because the earthquakes to which I above alluded—the great Asianic calamity of the first century—

[1] Cf. Suetonius, *Tit.*, 32, 52, for instances.

[2] Above, chap. xii.

or the worse than earthquakes upon the Roman throne, had already begun to work that dissolution which was stayed by the Flavians and Antonines, but set in with unmistakable seriousness before the second century had drawn to a close. Strabo speaks as the intelligent traveller who visits these cities and sees their material prosperity; Dion, as the counsellor who exhorts them to lay aside their foolish jealousies and factions; Pliny, as the prudent administrator who finds them reckless and dishonest in their local government and likely to repudiate their obligations. Pliny does not condescend to notice their mutual jealousies; but to Dion it is the main feature in their life, and that which mars their prosperity. Nor is it difficult to perceive that, however culpable, it was directly induced by the Roman policy of settlement (65 B. C.). The dynasts, the ecclesiastical cities, the free cities, were co-ordinated with varying privileges and various concessions of local autonomy. There were free cities (polities) under a treaty (*liberæ et fœderatæ*), free cities under no treaty (*liberæ*), Roman colonies, and mere subject polities (*civitates stipendiariæ*); lastly cities with the right of being the assize towns of the province, of receiving the incoming proconsul in their port, etc. But this was not all. As if these differences made between cities which claimed equality did not cause sufficient friction, the Roman authorities even changed them frequently, and, as far as we know, without sufficient reason.[1]

---

[1] Thus Byzantium, which always counted as an Asiatic city, was in the days of the war with Perseus made a *civitas fœderata* (about 167 B. C.). In the days of Lucullus (90 B. C.) it was a *civitas libera*. In 53 A. D. it appears as a *stipendiaria*, while Suetonius says its liberty was taken away by Vespasian (75 A. D.), and Pliny a little later speaks of it as free. Thus Cyzicus was first *libera* after the

For what strikes us as remarkable, when we consider these cases, is that the changes are not only ascribed to the conduct of the cities in some crisis—a reasonable cause—but to the influence of particular men. Thus in the history of Mytilene alone two men, otherwise insignificant, the philosopher Theophanes and the poet Crinagoras, appear, the one worshipped as the hero-founder of his city,[1] the other thanked in honorary inscriptions.[2] There seems little doubt that, in these cases at least, personal influence with Pompey and with Augustus was regarded as the cause of the city's recovery of its privileges.

If this was the case even with such serious politicians as Augustus; if he told the Alexandrians that he pardoned them for the sake of a personal friend; if Herod acquired a great popularity by his intervention with Agrippa[3] on behalf of cities like Ilium, what shall we say when such random rulers as Caligula or Claudius[4] were in power, one of them led by the caprice of the moment, the other con-

---

Mithradatic wars, lost the title in 20 B. C., regained it in 15 B. C., and lost it again under Tiberius. (I take these facts from Mr. Hardy's note, *Pliny's Correspondence*, p. 145.) So Mytilene was *libera* (probably *fœderata*) after the defeat of Antiochus (190 B. C.), captured by Lucullus and reduced to a *stipendiaria* (80 B. C.), made free again by Pompey, through the influence of Theophanes, probably reduced again by Antony, restored by treaty with Augustus (about 29 B. C.) through the intervention of Crinagoras. Chios, though not a *civitas fœderata*, yet possessed the right usually confined to such cities of trying civil suits affecting Roman residents (cf. *CIG.*, I, 2222, and the commentary of Mr. Hicks' *Manual of Inscriptions*, p. 356). There are no doubt many other such cases. Cf. the excellent tract of Conrad Cichorius, *Rom und Mytilene* (Leipzig, 1888).

[1] Cf. the passages from Strabo and Tacitus, the inscriptions found at Mytilene, and the coins cited by Cichorius, *Rom und Mytilene*, p. 7.

[2] Cf. the newly discovered inscription in Cichorius, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 *sq.*

[3] Above, p. 211.

[4] On Claudius cf. Tacitus, *Ann.*, xii, 62.

fessedly by his freedmen and women? Need we wonder that the richest and most persuasive citizens were told off to go to Rome—a great burden and a great trouble—and intercede with the emperor for some preservation or increase of privileges? Let us consider three cases, of which the first, which concerns Mytilene, has been made clear by recent discoveries.

In or about 27 B. C. the Mytileneans sent an embassy to Rome to pray for the renewal of an old "treaty of alliance," which would bring them under the class *liberæ et immunes.* They also carried with them as a present a golden crown, and announced a series of extraordinary honours conferred upon Augustus. They found that the emperor was abroad, and they were obliged to follow him to Spain. He sent a polite reply to Mytilene, and granted their request through a decree of the Senate. But not only do the people of Mytilene issue the most laudatory decrees to the principal envoys, the poet Crinagoras and the grammarian Potamon, but these persons were clearly selected because the former was (as we know from his extant epigrams) an intimate of Octavia, of Marcellus, and the rest of the imperial family, while Potamon had been the instructor and was the intimate of Tiberius, the emperor's stepson and successor. The decree of the Mytileneans even openly thanks Julia (Livia), Augustus' wife; Octavia, his sister; and the children and relations of the imperial house (e. g., Tiberius, Drusus, Marcellus), for their friendly influence. So unblushing was the assertion that private influence, and not the urging of just arguments, obtained these favours.

In consequence of such cases as this, the highroad to

Rome was trodden by a constant procession of embassies, carrying crowns and copies of decrees to the emperor, seeking either to settle some local quarrel in some one's favour,[1] or to obtain some privilege which a neighbour city had or ought not to have. And not only were the cities led into extravagance and the laying of heavy taxes on their wealthier citizens, for the purpose of giving and sending these honours and making these demands, but, as we shall see presently, they went into all manner of local ostentation in the way of public buildings, in order that the city of each might appear to the proconsul or the emperor, if he came there, worthy of the claims put forward for primacy or other privileges. But before we come to our evidence for this in Dion and Pliny, let us consider another example of an embassy, not indeed narrated to us by the Greek side, but even more instructive in showing us the trials and troubles of missions to such miscreants as Caligula,

---

[1] Historians often express surprise at the insignificance of the questions referred by Pliny in Bithynia to the emperor at Rome, but we have at least one rescript of Augustus to the authorities of Cnidos, which relates to an equally local affair. Here is his letter (*BCH.*, Vol. VII, p. 63):

"The emperor Cæsar, son of the God, Augustus, high-priest, elected consul for the twelfth time, in the eighteenth year of his *potestas trib.*, to the magistrates, council, and people of the Cnidians, greeting. Your ambassadors Dionysius [etc.] had audience with me at Rome, and handed me the decree (which they brought) accusing Anaxandrides, already deceased, and his wife Tryphera, here present, of the death of Eubulus, son of Chrysippus. But I, having directed Gallus Asinius, my friend [he was proconsul of Asia], to examine by torture the slaves implicated in the affair, ascertained that Philinus, son of Chrysippus, came three successive nights to the house of Anaxandrides and Tryphera with insults, and so to speak besieged them, and on the third occasion even brought his brother Eubulus with him; that then the proprietors, A. and T., when they were unable either by reasoning with Philinus, or by barring the house against his attacks, to enjoy safety within their own dwelling, directed one of their household slaves not to kill him, as perhaps others might have done in anger, and not without justification, but

Nero, and Domitian. I allude to the well-known *Embassy to Caligula* preserved to us in the works of the Jew Philo.

The antagonism of Jews and Greeks seems to have been peculiarly bitter; perhaps because they were the two leading subject races in character and ability, and had, indeed, contended for predominance even under the Ptolemaic and Seleucid monarchies; of this the reader will find ample evidence in my earlier volume on Hellenistic life. In the present case the ambassadors of the anti-Jewish Alexandrians could not aspire to secure (as Mytilene had done) such high influence as the relations of Caligula might exert, if, indeed, those that remained could venture to approach this homicidal lunatic; but they were believed, says Philo, to have heavily bribed beforehand Helico, his favourite freedman, jester, and boon-companion. We have in Philo's very rhetorical tract on the character and policy of this emperor an account of what the writer and his four companions had to endure during their mission to Italy.

to check him by emptying slops upon him, and that the slave, whether intentionally or not (he has persisted in denying all intention), let the utensil go with its contents, and Eubulus succumbed to it, who deserved this fate less than his brother. I have, moreover, sent you the records of my investigation.

"I should be surprised that the defendants in this case so greatly apprehended the examination of their slaves before your court, did you not seem to me very prejudiced against them, and affected with misplaced indignation, not against those who deserved whatever they suffered, coming as they did thrice by night with insults and violence to other people's houses, and violating public security, but against those who were unfortunate, but not criminal, in defending themselves. But now you will, I think, do well to attend to my decision in this matter, and see that your public records are in agreement with it. Farewell."

This is a case of the authorities of a free town consulting the emperor before they made their decision. But if all such local disputes came up before the emperor, how could the imperial government ever get through its business? I give the Greek text in Appendix B.

The madness of the emperor made their audience stranger and more absurd than would otherwise have been the case; they were obliged to run about after him through various new apartments in his villas, and wait for stray observations and jokes vouchsafed to them during intervals in his inspection and direction of his appointments. The rival embassy of Alexandrian Greeks, and apparently other envoys, followed with them; for poor old Philo tells with disgust how there were cheers and clapping of hands when Caligula uttered some jibe against the Jews and their religion. Such loud expressions vexed the emperor's household, who thought a mere smile the strongest utterance of pleasure consistent with court etiquette. However exaggerated Philo's story, and indeed his style, may be, the impression he produces is so thoroughly in harmony with other evidence that we may give him general credence.

He tells us that ambassadors must submit to any indignities for the sake of the polities they represent, and, indeed, what they had to expect when they returned is told us by Dion,[1] when recounting to his fellow-citizens his conduct towards them and their requital:

> But I wonder most of all at the ill-nature of some men, or rather their folly, when I remember how they began to talk about the embassy of congratulation which we sent to Rome.[2] It was said that the emperor did not receive the embassy courteously, but was rather vexed with it, as if they expected him to meet us at his hall door, and to embrace those that came, and ask by name, after those not yet arrived and make enquiries about Dick, Tom, and Harry, what they are doing, and why they did not come. Others again said that he was giving great gifts

---

[1] περὶ ὁμονοίας, ii, 92.

[2] On either Nerva's or Trajan's accession.

> to Smyrna and its people, and, by Jove, added that if somebody had been sent to talk to him, he would have granted 10,000 councillors at this person's request, and turned a flood of gold into the city, and no end of money would have been distributed. In all of which there was not a word of truth. Why should we be vexed if other people obtained great gifts? For the emperor, being the most amiable and sensible of men, granted alike to me what I asked and to others what they petitioned to obtain.[1]

Probably the answer made to all this was: Why, then, did you not ask for more? since Dion was rather fond of parading his intimacy with Nerva. Nothing is more disappointing to foolish people than to fail in obtaining some frivolous advantage through one who professes himself of influence among the great. And this disappointment finds vent in spite against the mediator who has excited delusive hopes.

Accordingly, the orator tells us that, having returned, when in favour at Rome and in power, to his native Prusa, after his long exile and wanderings under Domitian's tyranny, he desired to present his city with a new *stoa* or colonnade, which seems to have occupied the same sort of importance in these Hellenistic cities as the glass arcades which the Italians have built in Milan and Genoa, and for which they threaten to destroy historic buildings in several other cities. It is the public lounge in bad weather for people who cannot bear rain. However, Dion proposed to build this *stoa*, "seeing," he says, "that we were behind neighbouring cities in this respect." Of course, the proposal was received with applause, and

[1] Here is a modern parallel. When it appeared, after the famous Berlin Conference (1878), that no advantage had been secured for Italy, the whole Italian press burst into fury at the incompetence or treachery of the Italian envoys.

> ratified by votes of the council and the assembly in the theatre.
>
> I will not detail what I underwent, measuring and calculating, when the work began, how it might turn out handsome, and might not, like so many other such buildings, fall to pieces and be of no use; or what I underwent in journeys to the mountain [to the quarries], a thing in which I had no experience. But then there arose constant talk, though not among many, yet most disgusting, that I was demolishing the whole town, and was turning all the citizens out of their houses; that the whole place was tumbled upside down and destroyed, so that nothing remained. And there were some lamenting over somebody's smithy, and grieving that these memories of our ancient splendours should not be preserved, talking as if the Propylæa or Parthenon at Athens, or the Heræon at Samos, were being disturbed, and not shabby and contemptible ruins, worse than the hovels in which they keep sheep, which not a shepherd or even a better-class dog will enter—buildings at which you blush and look the other way when the proconsul comes to see us, while your adversaries laugh at them; in which even the mechanics could not stand up; which gaped and shook at every stroke of the hammer. And yet there were people grieved at the disappearance of this our former poverty and obscurity, who would not look at the pillars and pediments rising around them, or at the workshops built elsewhere for the dispossessed; as if they cared for nothing but to keep you down to your old level. For you know well that it is by *public buildings and feasts, and having your own law courts, and not having your accounts examined elsewhere, or paying taxes in common with others,* that a city attains self-respect and is honoured by the strangers who reside in it, and by the Roman governors.

Before I comment further on this passage, let me conclude concerning Dion's grievances, which are further noticed in his forty-seventh oration, and corroborated by the eighty-first letter in Trajan and Pliny's *Correspond-*

ence. The opposition went so far that a certain Flavius Archippus, a philosopher, a man evidently of bad character,[1] charged the orator with spending public money on his *stoa* without rendering account of it. Dion[2] complains bitterly of this treatment, and calls upon his townsmen to make up their minds, and either to trust him with the work or to declare against it, in which case he will leave the city, and retire to one of the many which have elected him to honorary citizenship, and will be proud to receive him.

In weighing the statements of Dion, I do not feel sure that the objections to his *stoa* were altogether so frivolous as he represents them. There are, and always have been, in every town a minority who love the old and the delapidated for their own sakes, and who, though unable to restrain the majority from erecting monuments of their recent and vulgar prosperity, have a great effect as grumblers, and easily persuade the jealous mob that the new plans are bad, that the contracts are jobbed, and that, in fact, the so-called improvements are not improvements at all, or at least nothing like what had been expected. This may have given the real backbone to the objections against Dion's liberality, not to speak of the niggard allowance made by the average man for pure patriotism and unselfish generosity in those who are his superiors, and whose motives he can interpret only by his own.

Let me add that these suspicions must have been much fortified by the general condition of the public works undertaken by the several cities, as we find them described in Pliny's *Correspondence*.[1] While Nicomedia and Nicæa were quarrelling furiously about the title of primacy, which Nicæa still claimed, though Nicomedia was the legal metropolis, Nicomedia had undertaken—for the purpose, no doubt, of *living up to* its claims—an expensive aqueduct, Nicæa a great theatre and the rebuilding of a burnt-down gymnasium on an enlarged scale, both of which Pliny found unfinished, useless, and in ruins.[2] On such undertakings the cities had lavished money which was simply thrown away. He consults Trajan whether these buildings should be finished at public cost, whether the money promised by ambitious citizens should be demanded; he adds that a rival architect had assured him (apparently on false grounds) that one of these works (the gymnasium) would require complete rebuilding.[3]

---

[1] This appears not only from Letter 58 of the series, which mentions his condemnation to the quarries for perjury, but from his conduct in this dispute when ordered to state his case.

[2] ii, 135.

Other such cases occur in these letters, where the polities seem steeped in debt, and have evidently squandered their money on pure ostentation, and that not even of a successful kind. For it seems plain from Pliny's constant requests for an architect or surveyor to be sent from Rome (though Trajan reminds him that there are clever people of the kind among the Greeks, whom they even import to Rome), that there was scandalous jobbery; that either the architects or the contractors selected by the cities were dishonest; for the work seems always unfinished or going to pieces. Pliny, it is true, never makes this moral charge; indeed, the sentence just quoted is the only one where he mentions the rivalries of the architects; but the facts he reports, and the general character of these Greeks, as disclosed to us by Dion, make the inference inevitable. Owing to the Bithynian Greeks being mixed with the aborigines,[1] they were very anxious, as appears from various allusions in Dion, to show that they were pure Hellenes; and, indeed, without attaining the virtues of the old Greeks, they exhibited their defects with remarkable faithfulness.

---

[1] *Epist.*, 37, 39, ed. Hardy.

[2] To judge from what has happened recently in the colonies of Australia, where useless and expensive public works were undertaken in order to find public wages for the labouring class, and so secure their votes for the promoters, there may have been some similar political reasons for these large public contracts.

[3] "præterea architectus, sane æmulus ejus a quo opus inchoatum est, adfirmat parietes quanquam XXII. pedes latos imposita onera sustinere non posse" (*op. cit.*, p. 139, with Mr. Hardy's notes).

The Greek levity had no doubt long since been contrasted by the Romans with the seriousness of the only other subject race which furnished them with remarkable men; I mean the Jews. We can hardly find that any Greeks were of more importance in the imperial counsels than were Herod and Agrippa, his grandson; and the jealousy of the two races as regards Roman favour was accentuated by many collisions, in which the Greeks were by no means always the victors. Many Greek cities were thankful to invoke the mediation of Herod, and the great prominence given by Tacitus to the war of Titus against the Jews shows how clearly the strong Roman felt the opposing strength of another race with tough traditions, and a more than Stoic contempt of pain and death. It is true that the Jews occupied but a small territory in southern Syria, encompassed with many Greek cities. But just as the strength of the Greeks lay, not in their decaying peninsula, but in their *diaspora*—their settlements all over the world—so the Jews were an ubiquitous nation, imbued at the same time with a strong affection for the one spiritual centre of the race at Jerusalem. This gave them unity and power, which the Greeks did not possess. Philo, composing a very rhetorical letter as the missive sent by King Agrippa to Caligula, speaks of the spreading of the Jews as follows:

---

[1] This is clearly shown by the strange list of Ilian names found by Dr. Schliemann, and published, *Troja*, p. 631, and elsewhere.

> This sacred city is the metropolis, not only of the one country Judæa, but of most lands, by reason of the settlements she sent out from time to time to the bordering lands of Egypt, Phœnicia, and the rest of Syria; also into the more remote Pamphylia, Cilicia, most of Asia as far as the recesses of Pontus; likewise to Europe, Thessaly, Bœotia, Macedonia, Ætolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, as well as most and the best parts of the Peloponnese. And not only are the continents full of Jewish settlements, but so are the most famous of the islands, Eubœa, Cyprus, Crete. I omit the lands beyond the Euphrates. For very nearly all Babylon, and whatever other satrapies have good land,[1] have Jewish settlers. If therefore my fatherland obtain from you benefits, not one city, but tens of thousands are put under obligation, which are settled over every latitude of the habitable world—in Europe, Asia, Libya, in continents, islands, on seacoasts and far inland.[2]

Here, then, was the most important opposing element to Hellenism in the first century. The Greeks had the advantage in language. If the Jews desired to rival them, they must submit to speak in the established *lingua*

---

[1] This is an odd reason. We should rather have expected him to cite facilities for commerce, as the cause of attraction for Jews.

[2] *Leg. ad Caium*, 36.

franca of the Empire. And they did so with difficulty. Josephus says that up to his time only two or three Jews (of Palestine) had learned to speak Greek with fluency and good accent, seeing that the talking of many languages was despised among his people, being the mere accomplishment of any slave that chose to learn other than high and sacred knowledge. He himself had laboured to learn Greek grammatically in order to speak to the world.[1]

What he has told most plainly is the deep-rooted mutual hatred of Jews and Greeks. The main cause of revolt against the Herods was the adorning the Greek cities of Palestine and elsewhere with those public buildings which were essential to Roman Hellenism, while most of them were an abomination to the Jews—theatres, circuses, temples, votive monuments with graven images.[2]

> King Agrippa gave the people of Berytus at great cost a theatre for their yearly shows, and spent many myriads on distributions of corn and oil to the populace. And he adorned all the city with statues and images copied from ancient models [here we have the usual Roman copies of great Greek originals] and transferred to them well-nigh all the splendour of his kingdom. Hatred therefore against him waxed strong among his people, because he took away their substance to adorn a strange city.

And yet this Agrippa is represented by Philo as a most zealous and patriotic Jew, risking his life with Caligula to prevent the profanation of the temple.

How hateful this tampering with Greek fashions was to the Jews, and how insurgent was the bitterness of feeling, appears still more clearly from the massacres of

---

[1] Cf. the very interesting personal epilogue, *Antiq. Iud.*, xx.

[2] *Ibid.*, xx, 9. 4.

Jews by Greeks, and of Greeks by Jews, mentioned in Josephus' *Life:* "Those that dwelt in the cities of Syria round about, seizing the Jews that dwelt among them with their wives and children, slew them, having not a single charge against them."[1] "The party of (the insurgent) Jews murder all the Greeks dwelling in the king's palace (near Tiberias), being such as before the war had already been their enemies."[2] In the opinion of Josephus, it was Gessius Florus, a Greek of Clazomenæ, whose appointment by Nero over the Jews led to the downfall of Jerusalem.[3] So also in the fragments of Nicolaus,[4] which tell of the troubles after the death of Herod the Great, it appears that, while both Jews and Greek cities agreed in desiring to escape from the Asmonean dominion, of which the Greek cities had hitherto been the main support, the nationalities were at deadly variance. Josephus reports an insurrection or civic conflict at Cæsarea, put down by Felix, Nero's governor, with military interference. It was between Greeks and Jews of this city concerning equal rights (περὶ ἰσοπολιτείας). The Jews, relying on their wealth and consequent importance, asserted their rights on the ground that their king, Herod, had been the founder. The Greeks retorted that it had been a city known as *Strato's Tower* long before, and that of this ancient city no Jew was among the founders. The Roman governor, of course, sided with the Greeks.[5] When,

[1] 7. [2] 12.

[3] *Antiq. Iud.*, xx, 11. The first form of this great war, which broke out in April, 66 A. D., was between the ἔθνος of the Jews and the Greek πόλεις, each of whom massacred such opponents as were in their power (Josephus, *Bell. Iud.*, ii, 18).

[4] Müller, *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, Vol. III., p. 353.

[5] *Antiq. Iud.*, xx, 8. 7.

therefore, we are told in the Gospel[1] that certain Greeks desired to see Jesus, and forthwith He exclaims, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified," we must understand these Greeks to have been inhabitants of some of the surrounding and independent polities, established there in antagonism to the Jews, hostile intruders in race and religion, who stood aloof with hatred and contempt. To interest these people in the Gospel, to conquer such prejudices, was, indeed, the victory which overcame the world.

If the hatred of the Jews was outspoken and intense, the hatred of the Greeks was silent and contemptuous. Though thousands of Jews were settled in Greece and in Asia, neither Dion nor Plutarch mentions them except to express contempt; the great Jewish books already before the world in Greek receive no attention; and when the war in Judæa ended with the destruction of Jerusalem, it may have appeared that the battle was won by the Greek, and that his ever-present, subtile, persistent rival in the mart, in the palace, in the very household of the Roman magnate, was finally defeated. But if the Greek was preeminent in language, the Jew was superior in what the Greek lacked—that religious fervour which not only preached a dogma, but made it a principle, and thus satisfied the spiritual craving of the world for some refuge against the tempests of unbelief and superstition.

[1] Gospel of St. John xii, 20.

CHAPTER XVII

THE LITERATURE OF THE FIRST CENTURY

It remains for me to say something of the general character of secular Greek literature as we know it in the first century, the splendid blossom of Syrian Greek prose in our Gospels being reserved for another occasion. So poor are, indeed, the representatives, so little was done of importance between the days of Diodorus and Strabo on the one hand, and those of Dion and Plutarch on the other, that it was not worth while interrupting our enquiries into social life to give a separate estimate of letters under the early emperors. As we progress in time, and the Hellenistic tendencies of the emperors become accentuated, there is a corresponding recovery in Greek letters, so that under Hadrian, who comes next upon the scene, a positive revival takes place. And no doubt this revival was announced in the works of Dionysius and Longinus, of Dion and Plutarch. For with the age of Hadrian comes what is called the Sophistical development, to which I have so often alluded in the foregoing pages.

Every revival in literature depends upon the general conditions of the society to which it appeals, and which appeals to it; for it must be the voice of the people, or a large part of the people, even as Dion says that Homer is universally popular because he expresses the sentiments which are universal.[1] I will therefore recapitulate briefly what is scattered through the preceding chapters concerning the literary aspects of Greek life, and add some details which have not yet found a place in these pages.

---

[1] Dion, *Orat.*, vii (1. 130).

In the first place, the general observation holds good for this time also, that the masses of the poorer people were excluded from most of the benefits of literature. They were divided, of course, into country poor and city poor. Dion, in the sequel to the idyll which I have translated in a previous chapter, enters at length into the contrasts of these classes, and points out the miseries of the city poor, who must pay for every necessary of life, or beg for it, while the neediest country peasant can supply himself in kind. But while he urges upon his hearers to promote as much as possible country life, his own ideal picture shows that he did not conceive the pleasures of literature as forming any part of it. Even those who in his day professed to retire from society (for whom the term *anachoretes* (anchorite) was already in use) could, in his opinion, do it adequately by that mental abstraction which you may see practised in the streets of any town;

> whereas the mere search after solitude gives no more help in the long run than changing the bed of the sick. For you may see the flute-player performing or teaching his pupils on the very highway, nor does the noise or number of those that pass disturb him, and the dancer or dancing-master in the gymnasium does not mind those undressing or wrestling or idling near him; so it is also with the harpist or the painter; nay, even those that teach children to read sit with their pupils by the wayside, and in this thoroughfare there is no impediment either to teaching or to learning. For not unfrequently have I seen, as I passed through the hippodrome, crowds of men at various pursuits, one piping, another dancing, another exhibiting sleight of hand, another reading out a poem, another singing, another reciting

a history or a tale; and yet not a single one of these hindered the rest from pursuing his course. Philosophers, no doubt, and philologers demand seclusion and silence for themselves, and will not allow a sight or sound to disturb them, like sick people trying to go asleep. Yet men who live by the sea are not troubled by far greater noise; for they do not keep counting the waves, or noting the changes in their sound, or watching the sea-gulls skimming along or floating upon the ruffled water.[1]

I have allowed myself to run on translating this picturesque passage, for it leads us back to the superior condition of the city poor, as regards their chances of education. The great days of political discussion, such as those in the theatre of Athens or of Megalopolis, were gone, and from such meetings as that of which Dion has given a description, cited above,[2] no good could ensue. But though the climate of Greek lands made the life of the country poor far pleasanter than it is with us, and though there was not, in addition to the great inducements of paved ways, and lamps, and shops, that of escaping from mud and cold, which has acted so powerfully in clearing the country people into the towns of England; yet to the lively Greek the lively aspects and sounds of the town must have been very attractive. And if he could not, any more than his country brother, buy and read books, he at least could hear what was going on, he could listen to recitations, and to the specimens from new works read out by the booksellers; and, of course, he could profit by those constant doles of money and those public shows which the rich citizen felt compelled to afford him.

---

[1] *Orat.*, xx (1. 292). He does not hit the real point, which is that not noise, but noises are the real disturbance. A mill-wheel or a waterfall is even soothing with its continuous voice.

[2] See pp. 329 *sq.*

Even with extreme poverty there remained in these people no little pride; and Dion, in discussing what trades they should pursue, is (like Plutarch) curiously fastidious in excluding not only all professional promotion of immorality, but many skilled handicrafts, such as the ornamenting of the walls and ceilings of stately mansions, or the making of rouge or unguents, because they subserve to the luxury of the rich. He mentions by the way that it was habitual to cast up to people not only their actual employments, but those of their parents; if, for example, a man's mother had been a reaper or a vintager, or had been a wet-nurse for hire; or if his father had taught children, or brought them to and from school. This sort of society, vain, impatient, frivolous, which must in any case have been educated by hearing and not by reading, afforded, indeed, a very unpromising atmosphere for literature. To such people the old masters were no doubt tedious, the old tragedies and comedies out of date. They must have something startling, new, exciting, meant not for permanent profit, but for present amusement.

I think this tendency to superficiality must have been strongly promoted by the marked severance which now existed between serious philosophy and the other forms of literature—poetry and rhetoric. We can illustrate it not merely by contrasting authors, but by comparing an author with himself. Thus, for example, the philosopher Philodemus, of whom I have already spoken, has left us two kinds of work: dry prose tracts on music or on poetry, composed, as was the Epicurean fashion, with a deliberate contempt of style. The same man has left us poems on sportive or even loose subjects, filed and polished with the most minute care. He evidently regarded the two occupations as totally and radically distinct. Plutarch, indeed, and Dion endeavoured to combine moral teaching with grace of style, but the professional philosophers, especially those Cynics whom the orator describes as very numerous in Alexandria,[1] were, as the reader may see by looking back,[2] mere itinerant beggars, who collected crowds of children or sailors or idlers about them, and amused them with some performance partaking more of a mountebank's display than a reformer's work. There are not wanting in our own day extravagant forms of open-air preaching not unlike these performances. We find in an epitaph by Meleager, a century older, philosophy is even named as a kind of trade together with husbandry and shipping.[3]

Even more solid professors of philosophy, who corresponded in so many respects to our clergy, assumed the long hair, beard, and cloak which were distinctly an uniform, and which were regarded with the same kind of dislike that a clerical garb encounters among the ruder and looser classes in our own day. The street boys of Asia went even further, for Dion tells us[4] that, though nobody minds a country yokel or a petty trader wearing any dress he finds convenient, when they see a man with long hair, wrapped in a cloak without any tunic under it, they cannot let him pass by in peace, but provoke and worry and revile him, or even pull him about, if they think him not strong or likely to be assisted, although he merely wears the received garb of a philosopher. And this is so, though philosophers are not rare, like Getæ and Persians and Nasamones, with their strange clothes, but there are such crowds of them as exceed the cobblers or fullers or mountebanks or any other calling. Moreover, this is the usual dress in which men see the gods in temples, or ancient public benefactors, represented by the sculptors.[1]

---

[1] i, 403.

[2] P. 285.

[3] *Anth. Pal.*, ed. Didot, I, p. 363, No. 470:

> *ἔζησας δὲ τίνα στέργων βίον; οὐ τὸν ἀρότρου*
> *οὐδὲ τὸν ἐκ νηῶν, τὸν δὲ σοφοῖς ἕταρον.*

[4] ii, 39. 43; cf. Horace, 1 *Sat.*, iii, 133; Persius, i, 133.

Dion attributes this unpopularity[2] to the expressed or implied assumption of superiority in the profession—an assumption not justified by the lives of many of their number. Here, however, I am not further concerned with this crowd of self-constituted pastors of the people than to insist upon their severance from literature, both poetical and prose, and hence the danger to writers in that day of neglecting the solid and permanent teaching which is conveyed through letters, the most universal and effective of the fine arts, and of attending to mere formal perfection. And again, even in literature we have another deep gulf between the learned grammarians, the analysts of Epic and Attic diction, of metre, of rhythm, and those who devoted themselves to *belles-lettres*. Not that the latter were wanting in even excessive learning. But serious and sportive subjects were now incongruous; the former were monopolised by prose writers; the latter were wholly given up to that crowd of epigrammatists who afford the only really prominent feature in the poetry of this long and famous epoch.

[1] The well-known statue of Sophocles in the Lateran Museum at Rome is a specimen of this costume.

[2] *Orat.*, lxxii, *On the Philosophic Garb.*

The great body of this Greek poetry, now gathered, with much that is both earlier and later, in the *Anthology*, has received but occasional and scant attention from modern scholars, so that the workmanship of the principal poets has been disclosed only by very recent researches. It now appears that to write an epigram in strict form was no easy task, and that the niceties of cæsura and rhythm must have been discussed at Alexandria, Cos, and Gadara with even more minuteness than the laws of the sonnet among modern poets. It is not the province of this book to go into such special questions; I shall therefore content myself with giving the results gathered by Rubensohn in his recent edition of Crinagoras, where the tracts on this special subject are named and their essence extracted.

It appears that Callimachus was the father of this new and more precise method of writing elegiacs[1] according to which each verse was to begin with sedateness, and hurry towards the close. Thus spondees were almost the rule at the opening of each line—the second half of the pentameter being necessarily dactylic. If the former half was dactylic, this defect was to be remedied by having at least two cæsuras. The earlier and better poets adhered strictly to these rules.[2] Here is another law: The pentameter must not end with an iambus in a separate word—the only two cases occurring in Callimachus being accounted for by one being a proper name and the other a rhetorical point. Crinagoras also has but two doubtful instances. Turning back to the hexameter, of which the

[1] Cf. Kaibel's tract on *Philodemus' Epigrams* (Greifswald, 1885).

[2] Cf. the cases cited, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

first four feet only are variable, we find Crinagoras, out of 137 verses, writing 90 in one of the following four forms: *dsdd* (30), *dddd* (22), *sddd* (23), and *ssdd* (15). Of the other twelve possible combinations two are not at all, the rest very sparingly, used. It appears further that a spondee is not allowed before the bucolic cæsura (where the fourth foot ends a word), neither, as in Homer, is the second syllable of a dactyl there permitted to end a word, so that a line emended by Boissonade into *Ἄχρι τευ, ὦ δείλαιε, κεναῖσιν ἐν ἐλπίσι θυμέ* violates the laws of Crinagoras. This poet went even so far in the more polished inscriptions on votive monuments as to make all his hexameters uniform in cæsura. He was, however, very free in admitting hiatus, and in this latter point he differed from Meleager and the more careful of his school, who admitted hiatus only at the end of a foot, generally at the end of the fourth. What is called trochaic hiatus—between the second and third syllables of a dactyl—was carefully eschewed.[1] But as regards cæsura the stricter epigrammatists were seldom content with that in the third foot, supplementing it with the favourite bucolic cæsura, which they regarded as almost necessary if the first cæsura did not occur till the fourth foot.

These are but some of the subtleties which have been recently discovered by the minute patience of Kaibel, Meyer, and others; and no doubt they will be increased in number as time goes on. It appears, according to the Hellenistic poetasters, that the opening line of Homer's *Iliad* contains three violations of strict metrical rules.[2]

---

[1] Cf. the details in Kaibel's *Philodemus*, p. 5.

[2] Cf. Rubensohn, *op. cit.*, p. 33. Any word belonging to the first foot must not end in the second with a trochee, as does ἄειδε. Then

When, therefore, we wonder at the stiffness and the obscurity of many of these short poems, we should remember that the poets put themselves under restrictions as exacting as those of the most complicated lyric poetry. Of course, it did not require a poet, but a smart person, to compose these little sportive pieces, as we know from an interesting allusion in Plutarch. He tells us of a soldier who found after a long time the coins he had entrusted to the half-closed hand of Demosthenes' statue at Athens, and that there was quite a competition among the *Euphuists* in composing epigrams, when so striking a subject came before the public.[1] These poems are, therefore, an evidence of a certain phase of social life, though they contain few allusions to anything distinctive in manners and customs. Nor did they help any more in educating the people—which poetry ought to do—than the writing and solving of acrostics do nowadays.

To attempt any detailed review of the great group written during the period of the present book would require a volume in itself, and I think vague generalities so unfruitful that it seems better to select two or three of the best, and say a word or two on them, with some quotations. Even this task is not easy, seeing that in the vast thicket of the *Anthology* no attempt is made at chronological paths, and the works of many centuries are jumbled together in inextricable confusion. Separate editions of single poets, such as the excellent ones above cited, are still rare, and not easily accessible.

---

the strong cæsura must not be obtained by an iambic word like θεά. Lastly, cæsuras in the third and fifth feet are not to be used in the same line!

[1] Plut., *Demosthenes*, 31: πολλοὶ τῶν εὐφυῶν ὑπόθεσιν λαβόντες . . . . διημιλλῶντο τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι.

Let us begin with Meleager of Gadara, one of the best of them, who was, moreover, the first collector of a large selection into what he called a *garland*.

The poet leaves us in no doubt as to his origin. He was born in *the Attic Gadara*[1] *founded among the Assyrians*, as these writers often call Syria; he was brought up at Tyre; in his old age he settled at Cos, not without travelling as far as Byzantium. All this he writes in the epitaphs he composed for his own tomb. He boasts that he combined Love, the Graces, and Wisdom in his work. I take this "wisdom" to mean poetic artifice, for of philosophy I find no trace. The reader will note that, just as it was remarked of Nicolaus,[2] so here Meleager is proud of his Syrian home; for while in this and the next century it could claim through the Gospels more literary distinction than belongs to any other province of Hellenism—not, of course, including the invented myths, which gave an old Attic or Argolic origin to these really Macedonian settlements—he allows contact with Syria to tell upon his work. He twits one of his flames for being addicted to a quiet Sabbath, and says Love is feverish even on that day. He says farewell, in one of his auto-epitaphs, in Aramaic, in Phœnician, and in Greek. We may therefore regard him as the most perfect embodiment of that Hellenism which transfused the eastern provinces of the Empire. There is no allusion to Jewish troubles, to the conflict with the Greeks, to the settlement of Pompey, to any one of all the momentous events which happened during the poet's life. Were we to believe his epigrams, he spent all his passionate days among fair women and boys, of the most perfect beauty and the most abandoned character. But if I read aright this child of his age, we need no more credit his picture of the promiscuous amorousness of Helleno-Syrian society than the contrasted picture of the ideal shepherds in Dion's idyll, who knew nothing but the chaste bond of marriage. We may even suspect this hyper-anacreontic Anacreon, with his wicked beauties and his distracting Ganymedes, to have been a respectable and hard-working man, labouring out his elegant conceits, polishing his lines, and seeking by the simulation of art to produce the impression of the storm and tumult of a love-tost soul.[1]

---

[1] Philodemus of Gadara, his contemporary Antipater of Sidon, and other names show that Syria was now a fruitful source of literature.

[2] Above, p. 212.

In three directions I hold him to have attained great perfection: in pathetic exclamation, in passionate soliloquy, and in richness of pictorial epithets.[2] And if he tells us nothing of the politics or home life of his day, he is both observant and picturesque upon natural phenomena, as when he beseeches the mosquitoes, "shrill-sounding, shameless siphons of human blood, two-winged monsters of the night," to spare his beloved; or again to wake her with his love message, while they leave her husband asleep; as when he prays the cicada, "the beguiler of his desire, the lyre of Nature, drunk with dew, to bring him midday sleep beneath the plane tree's shade."[1] His garlands of flowers, too, are composed of real spring flowers, and such as bloom together[2]—the narcissus, the crocus, smiling lilies that haunt the hills, the purple hyacinth, and the opening rose are entwined about his beloved's head.[3] In consonance with this is his famous hexameter poem on the spring, which has led to countless imitations, from Horace to Goethe.[4]

---

[1] Cf. what was cited above, p. 160, from Cicero, in describing his contemporary, Philodemus, whose very similar epigrams were composed, perhaps even with disgust and contempt, to suit the taste of Roman libertines, by the dependent philosopher.

[2] Here are specimens of each. I quote from the Didot edition of the *Anthology:*

(vii, No. 476): *Αἰαῖ, ποῦ τὸ ποθεινὸν ἐμοὶ θάλος; ἅρπασεν Ἅιδας*
ἅρπασεν· ἀκμαῖον δ' ἄνθος ἔφυρε κόνις.

(xii, 117): *Βεβλήσθω κύβος· ἅπτε· πορεύσομαι. Ἠνίδε τόλμα.*
οἰνοβαρές, τίν' ἔχεις φροντίδα; κωμάσομαι.
Κωμάσομαι; ποῖ, θυμὲ τρέπῃ; τί δ' ἔρωτι λογισμός;
ἅπτε τάχος. Ποῦ δ' ἡ πρόσθε λόγων μελέτη;

(v, 177): *Ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς γλυκύδακρυς ἀείλαλος, ὠκύς, ἀταρβὴς*
σιμὰ γελῶν, πτερόεις νῶτα, φαρετροφόρος.

These features make him to us a far more interesting personality than Crinagoras, with his stricter verse, his frequent allusions to the imperial house, his display of affectation, varied with only one single exclamation from the heart in the midst of all his artificial politeness.[5] But as this latter poet as well as Philodemus can be easily bought and read in a good and cheap edition, I shall not further discuss them, but select another of the poets credibly assigned to the first century after Christ.

---

[1] v, 151, 152; vii, 195, 196.

[2] If we except the rose, which we know was artificially forced.

[3] v, 144, 147.

[4] ix, 363. Horace, *Odes*, i, 4, iv, 7, and Goethe's *Faust*, Part I, sc. 2, where Faust and Wagner go out together on Easter morning. I have printed the full text in Appendix C.

[5] I mean the soliloquy numbered 28 in Rubensohn's edition:

Ἄχρι τεῦ, ἆ δείλαιε, κεναῖς ἔτ' ἐπ' ἐλπίσι, θυμέ,
  πωτηθεὶς ψυχρῶν ἀσσοτάτω νεφέων,
ἄλλοις ἄλλ' ἐπ' ὄνειρα διαγράψεις; ἀφένοιο
  κτητὸν γὰρ θνητοῖς οὐδὲ ἓν αὐτόματον·
Μουσέων ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δῶρα μετέρχεο· ταῦτα δ' ἀμυδρὰ
  εἴδωλα ψυχῆς ἠλεμάτοισι μέθες.

Philippus of Thessalonica was the second collector of a garland of epigrams, and tells a certain Camillus, to whom he dedicates it, that, as Meleager has preserved the more ancient poets, he will gather the more modern, of whom he gives a list—Antipater, Crinagoras, Antiphilus, etc. He himself contributes about eighty pieces, but not by any means of the same merit as those of Meleager. Many of them are votive inscriptions on the tools of various tradespeople—fishermen, sailors, weavers, etc.—who retire in old age and lay aside their work. There is, however, hardly anything personal to be found; he mentions Actium and Leucadia; he is styled "of Thessalonica;" he wonders at the great piers of Agrippa that made the harbour of Puteoli; at the elephants which, once a source of war, now only serve to draw the car of Cæsar. This exclusive attention to Rome and Roman affairs is, in fact, the only personal feature of this poet (who seems to have lived till the days of Nero), of Crinagoras, and of the rest in the imperial epoch, as contrasted with the earlier Meleager and his fellows. Many Romans, even Marcellus and Germanicus, appear as contributors to Philippus' volume. Unfortunately, both these earlier collections are mixed up with later and worse work in a confusion perhaps impossible to unravel. We notice in Philippus sarcastic attacks on the book-worm class, in close imitation of the men of Callimachus' day, but perhaps peculiarly suitable when learned studies had become specialised and completely separated from all polite literature. I have quoted some specimens in Appendix D.[1]

[1] I have deliberately omitted any discussion of the so-called *Anacreontics*, preserved to us in a manuscript containing also the epigrams; and this for two reasons. The great majority of these

I do not think it would add new features of interest, were I to specify many other small distinctions to be found among these poets. They plainly diffused among the higher classes a taste for this sort of ingenuity, which led people into studying a kind of art, a kind of letters, a kind of artificial verse, and the learning of mythology necessary to supply them with images and allusions. It was, as I said, an amusement like that of acrostics, but more finished and more artistic in proportion as Greek letters were more polished and more artistic than those of England.[1] Let us then turn for a few moments to the prose writing, which not only, on the one hand, rivalled the display and conceits of poetry, but, on the other, sought bravely to keep up purity of diction by a careful study of the great old masters in history and in eloquence.

The critics of Cicero's time (as represented by his rhetorical tracts), as well as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the writer *On the Sublime*, show so perfect an appreciation of what is good and great that we wonder at the total impotence of all the literary men to carry out the rules so admirably discussed by the theorists; nay, even of the theorists to carry out their own principles. The highest point of this revival of Attic purity is the writing of Lucian, which comes in the succeeding century; and yet

---

sportive love-poems belongs to an era later than that covered by this volume. But even if we could distinguish those of older composition, they are of no service to our social studies; for, to quote the just remark of M. Croiset (*Littérature grecque*, Vol. V, p. 1011), "we cannot find in all their songs a single indication either concerning themselves or concerning the men and things of their day."

[1] The collections of translations into Latin and Greek verse — *Sabrinæ corolla*, *Arundines Cami*, etc. — wherein the most finished scholars of the last generation have exhibited their ingenuity and their grace, are another similar "sport" in literature.

Cobet has amply shown how far removed he is from the masters whom he emulated. The Alexandrians studied grammar with extreme care, with the greatest models before them; and yet we find here too that no conscious labour will replace that subtle spirit which transfuses all the minds of a certain epoch, and makes it the golden age of a nation's literature. When this moment has gone by, not even the grace of Menander, the glow of Dion, the candour of Plutarch, can command it to return.

We have already tasted largely of Plutarch, the essayist, and Dion, the moral preacher; I do not feel bound to do more than mention Nicolaus, the historian, whose panegyrical history of Cæsar and Augustus is extant, as well as many fragments of his historical encyclopædia. We may suppose him to have been educated in the way which Dion recommends, and which I shall presently quote, as well as by his contact with Syrian and Roman courts, and with divine philosophy, on which he wrote many tracts for Herod. And yet his panegyric on Julius Cæsar and Augustus remains buried in the great forest of Carl Müller's *Fragments of the Greek Historians*, and will never be consulted or edited again for the world, except by specialists.

There is another historian, his contemporary, nay, his model, from whom he has copied pages. I mean Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who came to Rome shortly after the battle of Actium, and lived a literary life there for twenty-two years, giving special attention to the Latin language and historical literature. We may rank him, with Strabo, Nicolaus, and the so-called Longinus, as the best extant specimens of that class of Romanising Hellenists to whom the spiritual reconciliation of their country and scattered people with the domination of Rome was the ideal of a literary life. He seeks consciously to carry out the work and object of Polybius; but while that great historian had chosen with practical sense the period of historic contact between Greece and Rome, with its long-prepared causes in the growth of the latter power beyond the bounds of Italy, Dionysius desires to lead the student from the earliest times to the point where Polybius begins, and undertakes to show in the mythical history, in the legends, in the old, still surviving religious usages, proofs of an ancient and ever-repeated contact between Hellas and Rome. The older Roman writers, even Cato, had asserted this connection as the only means of claiming a decent national pedigree. If not Greek in origin, you must be barbarian. But when the historic magnificence of Rome was established beyond all doubt, there seems to have been a certain solace to the vanquished in asserting that, after all, these conquerors of the world were derived from an asylum of thieves and fugitive slaves—as we should say, from a criminal colony or a foundling hospital. This had been dilated on by some Hellenistic court-historians, themselves the slaves of royal slaves; a kind of consolation which satisfies spite and detraction.[1]

It is in reply to these anonymous persons that Dionysius writes his history of early Rome, attributing Greek manners, rites, language, to his Romulus and Remus, and putting into the mouth of the early kings discourses like the speeches in Thucydides. The misappreciation of historic evidence in all this is to us grotesque, though to a classical author of any period, not to say a close student and imitator of Thucydides, speeches were the natural expression of a political situation. But how even Polybius would have laughed outright at the notion of a speech from a mythical character! So, indeed, would he have laughed at the conservative attitude in religion of this learned rhetorician, which is truly Herodotean rather than Polybian, and mentions as one of the peculiar advantages of Italy over other lands that it is suitable, not only for all kinds of culture and human habits, but for the tastes of all classes of gods—mountains and glades for Pan, meadows and rich lands for nymphs, coasts and islands for marine deities; in fine, whatever suits any god or dæmon[1] is there to be found. Indeed, he often declines to give any opinion on theological difficulties, or to accept or reject the doctrine we find in Plutarch of intermediate dæmons, since all this is the specialty of that class which is quite separate and peculiar, the philosophers.[2]

---

[1] *Antiq. Rom.*, i, 4, *sub fin.*

And yet this man, so inferior as a historian to his great models—inferior not only in his conception of history, which he regards as a careful collection and arrangement of legends and uses, but in his very diction, which cannot lay aside rhetoric in the most incongruous situations—this Dionysius marks an epoch in his careful appreciation and criticism of the *style* of the old prose masters. It had been felt, ever since the days of Cicero, that Asianic flourish was no true eloquence, and that the Attic masters must be the proper models. But the Rhodian attempt to maintain this tradition was made without proper studies, and substituted the dry and jejune for the false and turgid. Under the reign of Augustus we find even the Latin poets going back from their Alexandrian models to the great masters, and the account given by Dion Chrysostom (a man far behind his age in minute learning) of what every gentleman ought to study[1] is very sound and reasonable:

---

[1] *Antiq. Rom.*, i, 38. Cf., for other specimens of the author's religious views, i, 67, *sub fin.*, where he recoils from religious curiosity, in imitation, I suspect, of Herodotus; and (ii, 19, 20) his remarks on indecent Greek myths and the difficulties they cause in religion, as compared with the more staid Roman creed.

[2] ii, 21: *ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ μὲν τούτων τοῖς αὐτὸ μόνον τὸ θεωρητικὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας μέρος ἀποτετμημένοις ἀφείσθω σκοπεῖν*, are his words in speaking of the alleged good and bad effects of the Greek myths.

> Let Homer, of course, be your daily spiritual bread, the beginning, middle, and end of every culture, for young and old, who gives to each as much as he can receive.[2] Lyric and elegiac poetry is all very well, if you have great leisure; otherwise you may pass it by. Thus in tragedy you may prefer Euripedes, and in comedy Menander, to the older *and perhaps greater*[3] masters, because these two contain more practical wisdom. History is essential, but Herodotus for charm and Thucydides for excellence are far superior to Ephorus, Theopompus, and the rest.

In oratory Demosthenes is, of course, supreme in force, and Lysias in the disguise of force, but Dion recommends Hypereides and Æschines, as it is easier to understand their art. Nor will he object to the modern rhetoricians of the previous generation being studied, especially as men approach them with a free critical spirit, and not in that slavish admiration which they feel towards the ancients. Among Socratic thinkers none is serviceable to the man of action except Xenophon, who, indeed, is in history also the most perfect and excellent of masters.

---

[1] He uses *ἄσκησις* for careful study, thus leading the way to the later meanings which have given us the words "ascetic" and "asceticism."

[2] *Orat.*, xviii, 1. 282: *Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἀφ' αὑτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύναται λαβεῖν.*

[3] Here we see the contrast to Plutarch's attitude (above, p. 380); Dion apologises to the critics who may object to his preference of the newer masters.

Such is the training in letters recommended by the most eminent orator of his century. It is only vague and general, not going into any detailed criticism; and this generality is also the character of the tract *On the Sublime*, formerly attributed to Longinus, but now placed by general agreement at the close of the Augustan age, and in that moment of reaction from Alexandrianism and Asianism to the pure Atticism of the golden age. This essay seeks to stimulate a taste for the real masterpieces in letters rather than to give any analysis of their excellence; it is the writing of a clever dilettante rather than of a professor, which, though very valuable in directing public taste, can hardly be said to have contained new knowledge. And yet among all the books of this age none has received more attention than this remarkable tract. It is certainly the most modern and enlightened of all that the Greeks have left us on the theory of art. Unfortunately, the text is miserably lacerated, and often breaks off in the middle of an important discussion.

The general attitude assumed by the author is that, though genius is distinctly heaven-born, its splendid results are attained by using the resources of art. He rightly holds fast to the great Greek principle that nothing perfect can be produced without study; that spontaneity may suggest, but will never work out, what is really beautiful or majestic. At the same time he agrees perfectly with the best modern criticism in recognising that irregularities may be only a flaw in genius of the highest order, perhaps even a characteristic of such genius, seeing that unvarying correctness is seldom, if ever, the attribute of the highest work. Thus in criticising the rhetor Cæcilius, who was evidently the advocate of strict correctness, and who consequently placed the pellucid but thin graces of Lysias above the richness of Plato, he breaks out (cap. 35) into the following reflections:

> What was in the minds of those godlike men who aimed at the highest perfections of their art, when they despised minute accuracy of detail? This, among many other considerations, that Nature hath not made our species mean and ignoble creatures, but, introducing us to life and all the universe around it, as to a great festival and pageant, to be spectators of all its grandeur and keen competitors for its prizes, hath engrained in our souls an indelible love of everything that is great, and therefore more divine than ourselves. Hence it is that to the speculation of man and the reach of his imagination not all the universe sufficeth, but our thoughts are ever passing its furthest bounds, so that if any one will consider in his own life how far the great exceeds the beautiful, he will know forthwith whereunto we were created. It is Nature which tells us not to admire the rivulet, though it be pellucid and fit for use, but the Nile, the Ister, the Rhine, and above all the ocean; nor are we struck by the fire upon the hearth, however clear be its flame, but rather by the celestial fires, oft though they be obscured, or again by the crater of Ætna, whose eruptions cast from its abysses vast masses of great rocks, and send forth rushing torrents of essential fire.

On these grounds he worships the capricious and variable Plato, and appreciates the splendours of the rugged

Thucydides. If there be a flaw in his judgment, it is in his coldness towards Aristophanes.

Far more precise were the studies of Dionysius on the style of the great prose writers of his people, especially on the orators; and had all his work been preserved, we might well say that ancient criticism had nothing more to add to his researches. And yet even he does not seem to have led a school, but to have been an independent thinker. His extant studies upon Demosthenes and upon Thucydides make us regret deeply the loss of most of his parallel studies on the other orators.[1]

I will not dilate further upon these interesting features of the Augustan and Claudian literary renaissance; for they are all simply forms of erudition, and do not touch the social aspects of the Greek world either intimately or directly. So also I pass in silence the many collections of letters, almost all spurious, which may be found in the *Epistolographi Græci*, and of which readers of Latin will find poetical paraphrases in Ovid's *Heroides*. They, like the speeches in Greek histories, are what, in small people's judgment, great people ought to have said, not what they did say. Nor do any of the "elegant epistles" of this century approach in value those attributed to Plato and to Demosthenes, which, if they are spurious, are so well composed as to maintain their claim for genuineness among some first-rate critics.

---

[1] Cf., on the list of his remains, Nicolai, *Griechische Litteratur-Geschichte*, Vol. II, pp. 146–49; and also the constant references to him in Blass'. volume on Demosthenes in his *Attische Beredsamkeit*. Dionysius, like Cæcilius, is too strictly the professor as regards Plato and Thucydides, and cannot enjoy their greatness without feeling constantly shocked at their irregularities. In this respect, therefore, we should rank our Longinus higher.

The whole of this literature was a literature of erudition, knowing no other excellence than to copy great ancient models, and rightly basing the perfection of this imitation on close and protracted study. No hint reaches us of popular poetry; no echo of popular stories; no fresh source in this barren land from which some new genius might, like Theocritus, draw a new "draught of Hippocrene" and attempt the rejuvenescence of Greek literature. The so-called revival of Hadrian's day, the Sophistic literature of the next three centuries, as it appears in Lucian, Aristides, Libanius, what is it? What effect did it exercise upon any large mass of the people? What model did this second-hand brilliancy show to the men of other ages and of inferior culture?

There was, indeed, another literary work going on during this century of the first magnitude, as the result has amply proved; but it was in a remote corner of Hellenism, unknown, moreover, to the most learned and curious of the Greeks, to Dion and to Plutarch. For there, where Hellenism had to struggle with the force and ability of Judaism, teaching and learning with the interest of hate and the relish of antagonism, there, among the common people, were springing up those books on the life of Jesus which touch the hearts of men with a directness and force very foreign to the flowery and rhetorical arguments of a Philo or a Josephus. The simplicity, the natural vigour, the unconscious picturesqueness in these narratives are so remarkable that, even had they never laid any claim to inspiration, sound judges must have condoned their faulty grammar and poor vocabulary, and acknowledged in them at least the voice of honest men speaking from the heart, and thus endowed with one of the highest literary qualities. Whether these writers were indeed "Israelites" or not, they were, as writers, "without guile," and the fact that they all chose Greek for their medium has been one great cause of the persistence of Greek studies to this day.

The slow recognition of these books—for their influence is first recognised, and only indirectly, in the correspondence of Pliny, if, indeed, the movement he reports did not result from mere preaching—is a feature well worthy of our notice. Whether they were kept secret from the cavils of the Greeks we know not; but considering the principles openly asserted in those days, considering the slavish adherence to the great Attic models, what was more obvious, what more certain, than that such pictures as the opening scenes of St. Luke's Gospel or the Sermon on the Mount would be despised by the critics as the work of late-learning and self-taught people, who knew nothing of the art of expression or of the laws of composition? And yet the world has judged differently; the idyll of Bethlehem lives, while the idyll of Eubœa lies buried in Dion; Herod the tyrant lives, while as the polished Hellenist he is forgotten; the metaphors on the mount, the parables by the way, have outlived the paradoxes of the Stoic, the rhetoric of the schools.

Yet as the vehicle of this new doctrine, this new exposition, was Greek, so it borrowed from Hellenism much of its tone, of its terminology, of its subtler thinking. Let no man imagine that the Christian faith owes nothing, or even little, to the Greeks. "The fulness of the time" for the Gospel came when Greek conquered Jew and Jew conquered Greek, and the world inherited the legacy of their struggle through Roman hands. For it was through Rome that the Greek spirit must be subdued—I mean the worldliness, the triviality, the slavishness, which had infected the Hellenistic world. Though all men used Greek and professed Greek culture, the influence of the Roman master was everywhere seen. Roman villas in their splendour have left their traces in many parts of Greece and Asia Minor; Roman luxuries are the natural form which wealth adopts in the Hypata of Apuleius, the Corinth of Aristides. There is hardly a treatise we have quoted which is not addressed to a Roman patron, and Roman names were everywhere being assumed as a distinction by Greeks.

Nor is it easy to estimate, as a feature in this Roman domination over the world, the effects of that apotheosis which was so often claimed by the emperors and so often thrust upon them by their Hellenistic subjects. As is well known, the gods of popular belief were so humanised by the treatment of poets and painters that the gulf between an exalted man and a degraded god could hardly seem insuperable. And perhaps it was rather the gods who were further assimilated to the emperor than the emperor to the gods. From one point, indeed, he was greater than any of them. Not only was his will law, but any one who violated it was promptly and visibly punished. Indeed, according as the imperial system became more completely regulated, the hand of the emperor reached more and more directly into the affairs of every province and controlled the life of every citizen. It is, of course, dangerous to draw inferences from individual cases, but the decree of the proconsul in Nero's day which has been preserved,[1] and datin a generation earlier than Pliny's commission to Bithynia, shows either a very different kind of man or a far more reasonable system. This officer expresses it as his principle to adhere to the decisions made by his predecessor, but when old documents bearing on the question and properly attested are produced, he settles (in the first person) a very knotty point, and reserves an exceptional privilege for the Christians by reversing the previous decree.

We cannot imagine Pliny doing such a thing. On every question, however trivial, he sends for Trajan's decision, and in no case does the emperor, though at times a little impatient, ever direct him to depend generally upon his own judgment.[2] And if the proconsuls and legates made themselves, or were made, mere ciphers by this centralisation, there are already occasional signs of what becomes so painfully prominent in later days—the transformation of provincial honours into provincial burdens. Pliny proposes to make wealthy men take up public loans in order that he may secure interest on the provincial funds, as there was some difficulty in investing them profitably. When the state cannot find men ready to invest for the security it offers, or when it insists upon higher than the current interest, we may be sure that there is something radically unsound in the economic situation.

Perhaps the wonder is that things lasted so well, and that the crisis did not come for so many generations.

---

[1] Cf. Hicks, *Manual of Inscriptions*, p. 355.

[2] It is perhaps to be urged in defence of this, that Pliny was not a regular governor, with officially defined powers, such as a proconsul, but a special commissioner sent to act for the emperor in a special enquiry.

Long before the days of Pliny thoughtful men had seen that the imperial system, destructive to local polities, had silenced the voice of eloquence, and changed the historian and the poet into the chronicler and panegyrist of imperial splendour. There is no more striking passage in the striking tract *On the Sublime*, which I have already noticed, than the passage in which he discusses the alleged effect of this organised submission to Rome, this just slavery, as he very properly calls it. The decadence of Greek literature was openly assigned by many to the embrace of this political boa-constrictor. Here is what "Longinus" says (§ 46):

> One thing, however, remains, which, my dear and valued friend, because of your desire for learning, I shall not hesitate to add and explain clearly. It is that difficulty which one of the philosophers very recently propounded. "I wonder," said he, "as doubtless do many others, how it is that in our age there is plenty of rhetorical power and forensic ability, pungency and readiness, fluency and charm of style, but none now, or almost none, of the true Sublime, the really majestic order of genius. Such a dearth is there over all the world of real oratory! Can it be," said he, "that we are to believe the common murmur, that democracy is the fostering nurse of genius, with which, almost exclusively, the race of orators flourished and with which it died away? For the province, they say, of freedom is to encourage the thoughts of the lofty-minded and to cheer them on, to promote the eagerness of emulous rivalry and the generous ambition to excel. Moreover, by the prizes proposed under free constitutions the intellectual powers of the orators are exercised and sharpened time after time; they have, as it were, their edges whetted; they shine forth, as might be expected, free with the freedom whose cause they serve. But we of the present day," said he, "seem to learn from childhood the discipline of a moderate slavery, having been from our tenderest years well-nigh

swathed in its manners and customs, never tasting oratory's noblest and purest fountain—liberty, for which reason we turn out nothing but magnificent flatterers." For this cause he held that any other profession was tenable even by the menial class, but that a slave could never be an orator; for, on the first effort, a long familiarity with enforced reticence and dungeon cells and continual thrashing bubbles up and leaves the orator tongue-tied, even as Homer says: "The half of valour goes when slavery comes."[1] "Precisely then," saith he, "if the thing may be credited, as the boxes, in which the so-called Pygmies or dwarfs are brought up, not only hinder the growth of the prisoners, but even by the bands surrounding their bodies contract their original dimensions; so might one represent all slavery, be it ever so moderate, as an encasing of the soul and neither more nor less than a general prison."[2]

I, however, taking him up, said: It is easy, my good friend, and quite natural for every generation, to find fault with its own position; but may it not be that, while the development of fine genius is indeed hindered by the peaceable state of the world, it is far more so by this boundless struggle that moves our lusts at its will, and further by these inflictions which hold this our age at their mercy, harrying and spoiling it without restraint? For the love of gain, for which we are all nowadays morbidly insatiable, and the love of pleasure, bring us into bondage, or rather, so to phrase it, cause a foundering of our lives, in which all hands are lost. Devotion to money is a degrading infirmity, devotion to pleasure a most degrading one. I cannot imagine, after the extravagant honouring or, more truly, deifying of vast wealth, how it is possible, when its attendant evils assault our souls, to deny them entrance. For, hard upon enormous and excessive wealth, and, so to speak, keeping step with it, follows lavish expenditure, and when the one throws open the gateways of cities and mansions, into which the former enters, there also the other makes itself a home. Then, having established their footing in men's lives, both build themselves nests, as philosophers tell us, and, soon falling to procreation, they engender haughtiness and pride and luxury, not falsely fathered upon them, but their very and legitimate offspring. But if one also suffers these descendants of wealth to attain maturity, speedily do they breed in the souls they occupy tyrants inexorable, insolence and licence and shamelessness. For such results must needs follow, and no more can men gaze upward, no more can reputation be of account, but the ruin of such a life must step by step be gathering to its climax, while all nobility and grandeur of soul must decline and wither and waste away, whenever men unduly exalt the perishable and sensual parts of their nature, and fail to cherish those which are immortal. For a man cannot, when he has taken a bribe for his decision—he cannot, I say, be an impartial and upright judge in the cause of right and of honour. One so corrupted can see no honour or right but in what profits himself. But where we all give over our lives, without intermission, to the control of bribery and legacy-hunting and seeking for dead men's places, while we sell for gain no matter whence it comes, our very souls, being enslaved without exception by the love of money, do we still, I ask, expect to find, amid all this pestilential corruption of life, judges of the sublime or the immortal, free and uncorrupted, uninfluenced in their votes by the passion for gain? But perhaps in such a state of society (and that state is ours) subjection is better than freedom; since otherwise the covetous feelings of men, discharged in a mass upon their neighbours, like beasts let loose from a den, might even set the whole world aflame with the miseries that would follow. In short, the present standard of mind and talent, I observed, was largely due to that indifference in which we all, with few exceptions, pass our lives, never labouring, never learning, except with the single view to applause or pleasure, but doing nothing for the just ambition and the merited renown of general usefulness.[1]

---

[1] *Odyssey*, xvii, 322.

[2] See the comment upon this passage in Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Vol. II, p. 195 (ed. Milman).

---

[1] I cite from Mr. Stebbings' translation (London, 1867).

There is nothing more difficult than to determine priority in the case of those reciprocal causes and effects which act upon large societies. No doubt the loss of political liberty draws with it many grave consequences to national character; but, on the other hand, political liberty will not be lost so long as the holders of it maintain their dignity and practise self-sacrifice for the public weal. All the vices which invade decaying states are interconnected, and none of them produces its fellow without being reproduced in its turn. It is more than probable, therefore, that both our author and the philosophers whom he criticises were right, and that a complication of disorders had already begun to affect the Roman Empire.

If these thinkers had gone back again to Plato, they might have found another consideration, which, if it had not brought them consolation, would have vindicated, partly at least, the decay which they deplored. By them, as by modern political theorists, the life of states is presumed to be permanent, never to pass away unless some active cause from without disturbs the equilibrium of things and produces a convulsion or a stagnation in the political cosmos. To them the Roman Empire was everlasting, as to us the permanence of our respective modern states is a sort of axiom which no one seems to question. But to the older political philosophers among the Greeks, to Plato, to Aristotle, who had described 150 different constitutions, the survey of this crowd of smaller polities, passing in and out of the atmosphere like meteors, suggested that even the larger and steadier bodies were not destined to be permanent; and each philosopher had accordingly set down in the natural history, even of an ideal constitution, those inherent causes which lead to the old age and the decay of the body politic, apart from all accidents or attacks from without. We can now see that such causes were at work even in the early Roman Empire; and no enumeration of defects or vices, no exhortations to reform, could possibly have averted the destiny of the ancient world.

It is probable that the same considerations apply to literature. Not all the education, all the analysis, all the criticism in the world can preserve, or even prolong, a golden age of letters which has arisen almost suddenly, spontaneously, the reflex of other greatness, the fruit of some marvellous summer, whose colour and flavour have a richness which no cultivation can reproduce. Such splendid seasons do not recur except at long and uncertain intervals. One of them was come and gone for Greek literature. Yet never were Greek letters more favoured and flattered than under the Flavian and Antonine emperors. Never was the world more happy and prosperous. Never were the conditions of society in the old world more humane and civilised. But in letters this age produced only a renascence, the bloom of Sophistical prose, which dazzled, indeed, its contemporaries, but laid no hold upon the world.

I will conclude with a modern parallel. There is none of our modern arts more prominent than architecture. There is none more aided by recent discoveries in the mechanical sciences. There is none in which proficiency is more conspicuous or more highly rewarded. And yet our architects seem incapable of any true originality. Their most successful efforts consist in the copying of ancient styles, and reproducing ancient masterpieces. Even in that inferior plane of art they have never equalled the productions of any truly architectural age. The Parthenon at Athens, the Santa Sophia at Constantinople, and the cathedral at Rheims are still unequalled.

It is a striking truth, too often forgotten in this our materialistic age, that the advancement in positive science is not always an advancement in art, and that the increase of luxury is by no means an advance in spiritual life.

APPENDIX A

(Cf. p. 304)

THE INSCRIPTION OF ACRÆPHIÆ CONTAINING NERO'S SPEECH

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ λέγει· "Τῆς εἴς με εὐνοί-
ας τε καὶ εὐσεβείας ἀμείψασθαι θέλων τὴν εὐγε-
νεστάτην Ἑλλάδα, κελεύω, πλείστους καθ' ὅ[σ]ο[ν]
ἐνδέχεται ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐπαρχείας παρῖναι
ἰς Κόρινθον τῇ πρὸ τεσσάρων Καλανδῶν Δε-
κεμβρίων."

Συνελθόντων τῶν ὄχλων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ προσεφώ-
νησεν τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα·

"'Απροσδόκητον ὑμεῖν, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, δωρεάν,
εἰ καὶ μηδὲν παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης
ἀνέλπιστον, χαρίζομαι τοσαύτην ὅσην οὐκ ἐχωρή-
σατε αἰτεῖσθαι. πάντες οἱ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ τὴν ἕως
νῦν Πελοπόννησον κατοικοῦντες Ἕλληνες
λάβετ' ἐλευθερίαν ἀνισφορίαν, ἦν οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς εὐτυ-
χεστάτοις ὑμῶν πάντες χρόνοις ἔσχετε·
ἢ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίοις ἢ ἀλλήλοις ἐδουλεύσατε.
εἴθε μὲν οὖν ἀκμαζούσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος παρειχό-
μην ταύτην τὴν δωρεὰν ἵνα μου πλείονες ἀπο-
λαύωσι τῆς χάριτος· διὸ καὶ μέμφομαι τὸν αἰῶνα
προδαπανήσαντά μου τὸ μέγεθος τῆς χάριτος.
Καὶ νῦν δὲ οὐ δὶ ἔλεον ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ δὶ εὔνοιαν εὐερ-
γετῶ, ἀμείβομαι δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῶν ὧν καὶ διὰ
γῆς καὶ διὰ θαλάττης αἰεί μου προνοουμένων πε-

πείραμαι, ὅτι μοι τηλικαῦτα εὐεργετεῖν παρέσχον. πόλεις μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι ἠλευθέρωσαν ἡγεμόνες, [Νέρων δὲ ὅλην] ἐπαρχείαν."

Ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν διὰ βίου καὶ Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Ἐπαμεινώνδας Ἐπαμεινώνδου εἶπεν· προβεβουλευμένον ἑαυτῷ εἶναι πρός τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον· ἐπιδὴ ὁ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου κύριος Νέρων αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ τρισκαιδέκατον ἀποδεδειγμένος, πατὴρ πατρίδος, νέος Ἥλιος ἐπιλάμψας τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, προειρεμένος εὐεργετεῖν τὴν Ἑλ[λ]άδα, ἀμειβόμενος δὲ καὶ εὐσεβῶν τοὺς θεοὺς ἡμῶν, παριστανομένους αὐτῷ πάντοτε ἐπὶ προνοίᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ, τὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος αὐθιγενῆ καὶ αὐτόχθονα ἐλευθερίαν πρότερον ἀφαιρεθεῖσαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἷς καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος φιλέλλην γενόμενος [Νέρων] Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος ἔδωκεν, ἐχαρίσατο, ἀποκατέστησεν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τῆς αὐτονομίας καὶ ἐλευθερίας προσθεὶς τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ δωρεᾷ καὶ ἀνεισφορίαν, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν πρότερον Σεβαστῶν ὁλοτελῆ ἔδωκεν· δὶ ἃ δὴ πάντα δεδογμένον εἶναι τοῖς τε ἄρχουσι καὶ συνέδροις καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, καθιερῶσαι μὲν κατὰ τὸ παρὸν τὸν πρὸς τῷ Διῒ τῷ Σωτῆρι βωμόν, ἐπιγραφότας· 'Διῒ Ἐλευθερίῳ [Νέρωνι] εἰς αἰῶνα', καὶ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωΐου συνκαθειδρύοντας τοῖς [ἡμῶν] πατρίοις θεοῖς [Νέρωνος] Διὸς Ἐλευθερίου καὶ θεᾶς Σεβαστῆς [Μεσσαλίνης], ἵνα τούτων οὕτως τελεσθέντων καὶ ἡ ἡμετέρα πόλις φαίνηται πᾶσαν τειμὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν ἐκπεπληρωκυῖα εἰς τὸν τοῦ κυρίου Σεβαστοῦ [Νέρωνος οἶκον]·

εἶναι δὲ ἐν ἀναγραφῇ τὸ ψήφισμα παρά τε τῷ Διῒ τῷ Σωτῆρι ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἐν στήλῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωΐου.

—*Insc. Græc. Sept.*, I, 2713.

N. B.—I reproduce strictly the spelling (often bad) and the forms (often incorrect). The hacking out of the name of Nero shows a revulsion of feeling in after-days, and is a common way of showing hostile feeling, both Greek and Egyptian.

APPENDIX B

(Cf. p. 409)

AUGUSTUS' LETTER TO THE CNIDIANS

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστὸς ἀρχιερεύς
ὕπατος τὸ δωδέκατον ἀποδεδειγμένος
καὶ δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ὀκτωικαιδέκατον
Κνιδίων ἄρχουσι βουλῆι δήμωι χαίρειν.—οἱ πρέσ-
βεις ὑμῶν Διονύσιος β̄ καὶ Διονύσιος β̄ τοῦ Διονυ-
σίου ἐνέτυχον ἐν Ῥώμηι μοι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀποδόντες
κατηγόρησαν Εὐβούλου μὲν τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδα τεθνε-
ῶτος ἤδη, Τρυφέρας δὲ τῆς γύναικος αὐτοῦ παρούσης,
περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Εὐβούλου τοῦ Χρυσίππου· ἐγὼ
δὲ ἐξετάσαι προστάξας Γάλλωι Ἀσινίωι τῶι ἐμῶι φίλωι
τῶν οἰκετῶν τοὺς ἐνφερομένους τῆι αἰτία[ι] διὰ βα-
σάνων, ἔγνων Φιλεῖνον τὸν Χρυσίππου τρεῖς νύ-
κτας συνεχῶς ἐπεληλυθότα τῆι οἰκία[ι] τῆι Εὐβού-
λου καὶ Τρυφέρας μεθ' ὕβρεως καὶ τρόπωι τινὶ πολ-
ιορκίας, τῆι τρίτηι δὲ συνεπηιγμένον καὶ τὸν ἀδελ-
φὸν Εὔβουλον, τοὺς δὲ τῆς οἰκίας δεσπότας Εὔβου-
λον καὶ Τρυφέραν, ὡς οὔτε χρηματίζοντες πρὸς
τὸν Φιλεῖνον οὔτε ἀντιφραττόμενοι ταῖς προσ-
βολαῖς ἀσφαλείας ἐν τῆι ἑαυτῶν οἰκίαι τυχεῖν ἠδύναν-
το, προστεταχότας ἑνὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν οὐκ ἀποκτεῖ-
ναι, ὡ[ς ἴ]σως ἄν τις ὑπ' ὀργῆς οὐκ ἀδίκου προήχθηι, ἀλ-
λὰ ἀνεῖρξαι ἀνασκεδάσαντα τὰ κόπρια αὐτῶν, τὸν
δὲ οἰκέτην σὺν τοῖς καταχεομένοις εἴτε ἑκόντα
εἴτε ἄκοντα, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐνέμεινεν ἀρνούμεν[ος],
ἀφεῖναι τὴν γάστραν [ὥστ'] Εὔβουλον ὑποπεσεῖν, δικαιό-
τ]ερον ἂν σωθέντα [τοῦ ἀ]δελφοῦ. πέπονφα δὲ ὑμεῖν καὶ α[ὐ-]

τ]ὰς τὰς ἀνακρίσεις. ἐθαύμαζον δ' ἄν, πῶς εἰς τόσον
ἔδεισαν τὴν παρ' ὑμεῖν ἐξετασίαν τῶν δούλων οἱ φ[εύ-]
γοντες τὴν δίκην, εἰ μή μοι σφόδρα αὐτοῖς ἐδόξ[ατε]
χαλεποὶ γεγονέναι καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία μισοπόνη[ροι],
μὴ κατὰ τῶν ἀξίων πᾶν ὁτιοῦν παθεῖν, ἐπ' ἀλλο[τρίαν]
οἰκίαν νύκτωρ μεθ' ὕβρεως καὶ βίας τρὶς ἐπεληλ[υθό-]
των, καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων ὑμῶν ἀσφάλει[αν ἀναι-]
ρούντων ἀγανακτοῦντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῶν καὶ [ὅτε ἠ̣-]
μύνοντο ἠτυχηκότων, ἠδικηκότων δὲ οὐδέ[ν].
ἀλλὰ νῦν ὀρθῶς ἄν μοι δοκεῖτε ποιῆσαι τῆι ἐμῆι π[ερὶ τού-]
των γνώμηι προνοήσαντες καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς δημ[οσίοις]
ὑμῶν ὁμολογεῖν γράμματα. ἔρρωσθε.

APPENDIX C

MELEAGER ON SPRING

Χείματος ἠνεμόεντος ἀπ' αἰθέρος οἰχομένοιο,
πορφυρέη μείδησε φερανθέος εἴαρος ὥρη·
Γαῖα δὲ κυανέη χλοερὴν ἐστέψατο ποίην,
καὶ φυτὰ θηλήσαντα νέοις ἐκόμησε πετήλοις.
Οἱ δ' ἁπαλὴν πίνοντες ἀεξιφύτου δρόσον 'Ηοῦς
λειμῶνες γελόωσιν, ἀνοιγομένοιο ῥόδοιο.
Χαίρει καὶ σύριγγι νομεὺς ἐν ὄρεσσι λιγαίνων,
καὶ πολιοῖς ἐρίφοις ἐπιτέρπεται αἰπόλος αἰγῶν.
Ἤδη δὲ πλώουσιν ἐπ' εὐρέα κύματα ναῦται
πνοίῃ ἀπημάντῳ Ζεφύρου λίνα κολπώσαντος.
Ἤδη δ' εὐάζουσι φερεσταφύλῳ Διονύσῳ,
ἄνθεϊ βοτρυόεντος ἐρεψάμενοι τρίχα κισσοῦ.
Ἔργα δὲ τεχνήεντα βοηγενέεσσι μελίσσαις
καλὰ μέλει, καὶ σίμβλῳ ἐφήμεναι ἐργάζονται
λευκὰ πολυτρήτοιο νεόῤῥυτα κάλλεα κηροῦ.
Πάντῃ δ' ὀρνίθων γενεὴ λιγύφωνον ἀείδει,
ἀλκυόνες περὶ κῦμα, χελιδόνες ἀμφὶ μέλαθρα.
κύκνος ἐπ' ὄχθαισιν ποταμοῦ, καὶ ὑπ' ἄλσος ἀηδών.
Εἰ δὲ φυτῶν χαίρουσι κόμαι, καὶ γαῖα τέθηλεν,
συρίζει δὲ νομεύς, καὶ τέρπεται εὔκομα μῆλα,
καὶ ναῦται πλώουσι, Διώνυσος δὲ χορεύει,
καὶ μέλπει πετεεινά, καὶ ὠδίνουσι μέλισσαι,
πῶς οὐ χρὴ καὶ ἀοιδὸν ἐν εἴαρι καλὸν ἀεῖσαι;
—*Anthology*, IX, No. 363.

APPENDIX D

(Cf. p. 433)

ON THE DOMESTICATED ELEPHANTS OF ROME

Specimens from Philip of Thessalonica's Epigrams:

Οὐκέτι πυργωθεὶς ὁ φαλαγγομάχας ἐπὶ δῆριν
  ἄσχετος ὁρμαίνει μυριόδους ἐλέφας.
ἀλλὰ φόβῳ στείλας βαθὺν αὐχένα πρὸς ζυγοδέσμους,
  ἄντυγα διφρουλκεῖ Καίσαρος οὐρανίου.
Ἔγνω δ' εἰρήνης καὶ θὴρ χάριν· ὄργανα ῥίψας
  Ἄρεος, εὐνομίης ἀντανάγει πατέρα.

—*Anthology*, IX, No. 285.

ON AGRIPPA'S MOLE AT PUTEOLI

Ἔζευξ' Ἑλλήσποντον ὁ βάρβαρος ἄφρονι τόλμῃ,
  τοὺς δὲ τόσους καμάτους πάντας ἔλυσε χρόνος·
ἀλλὰ Δικαιάρχεια διηπείρωσε θάλασσαν,
  καὶ βυθὸν εἰς χέρσου σχῆμα μετεπλάσατο·
λᾶα, βαθὺ στήριγμα, κατεῤῥίζωσε πέλωρον,
  χερσὶ Γιγαντείαις δ' ἔστασε νέρθευ ὕδωρ.
Ἦν ἅλ' ἀεὶ πλώειν· διοδευομένη δ' ὑπὸ ναύταις
  ἄστατος, εἰς πεζοὺς ὡμολόγησε μένειν.

—*Anthology*, IX, No. 708.

RIDICULE OF PEDANTS

Γραμματικοὶ Μώμου στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,
  τελχῖνες βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες,
Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται, ὃν ὡς ὅπλον ἐκτανύσαντες
  οὐδ' αὐτοῦ κείνου γλῶσσαν ἀποστρέφετε,

συνδέσμων λυγρῶν θηρήτορες, οἷς τὸ "μὶν" ἢ "σφὶν"
εὔαδε, καὶ, ζητεῖν εἰ κύνας εἶχε Κύκλωψ,
τρίβοισθ' εἰς αἰῶνα κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροὶ
ἄλλων· ἐς δ' ἡμᾶς ἰὸν ἀποσβέσατε.
—*Anthology*, **XI, No. 321.**

Χαίροιθ' οἱ περὶ κόσμον ἀεὶ πεπλανηκότες ὄμμα,
οἵ τ' ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου σῆτες ἀκανθολόγοι.
Ποῖ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ζητεῖν τίνας ἔδραμεν ἥλιος οἴμους,
καὶ τίνος ἦν Πρωτεύς, καὶ τίς ὁ Πυγμαλίων;
Γινώσκοιμ' ὅσα λευκὸν ἔχει στίχον· ἡ δὲ μέλαινα
ἱστορίη τήκοι τοὺς Περικαλλιμάχους.
—*Anthology*, **XI, No. 347.**

ON HERAS THE ATHLETE

Ἴσως με λεύσσων, ξεῖνε, ταυρογάστορα
καὶ στεῤῥόγυιον, ὡς Ἄτλαντα δεύτερον,
θαμβεῖς, ἀπιστῶν εἰ βρότειος ἡ φύσις.
Ἀλλ' ἴσθι μ' Ἡρᾶν Λαδικῆα πάμμαχον,
ὃν Σμύρνα καὶ δρῦς Περγάμου κατέστεφεν,
Δελφοί, Κόρινθος, Ἦλις, Ἄργος, Ἄκτιον·
λοιπῶν δ' ἀέθλων ἣν ἐρευνήσῃς κράτος,
καὶ τὴν Λίβυσσαν ἐξαριθμήσεις κόνιν.
—*Anthology*, **XIII, No. 321.**

INDEX

Academy, the New, 88, 99.

Achæus, 7.

Achilles Tatius, the romancist, 343.

Acilius, C., interpreter for the embassy of philosophers, 95.

Açoka, the empire of, 21 *sq.*

Acræphilæ, the inscription from, 453.

Acratus, Nero's "art agent," 277.

Actia, 309.

Actium, mentioned by Philip of Thessalonica, 433.

Acts of the Apostles, 266, 271, 316.

Adultery, Plutarch on, 396.

Ælianus, Ti. Plaut., legate of Mœsia, 117.

Æmilius Paullus, 98, 108.

Ænianes, the, 344.

Æschines, commended by Dion, 438.

Ætna, Mount, visited by Roman tourists, 256.

Ætolia, cities founded by kings in, 240.

After-life, punishment for sin and reward for virtue in an, a doctrine of Plutarch, 362, 369.

Agatharchides of Cnidos, 11, 76, 77, 225.

Agrippa, Herod, 416, 418.

Agrippa, M. V.: imposes fine on Ilium, 266; his statue in front of the Propylæa, 305; guild in his honour, 307; his moles at Puteoli, 433, 459.

Agrippeastæ, 307.

Albucius (the "Græculus"), in Lucilius, 181.

Alcius and Philiscus, 92.

Alexander: a possible world-emperor, 1, 142; his innovations in methods of colonisation, 235; romantic histories of his life, 315.

Alexander Bala, 61.

Alexander Jannæus, 62, 203.

Alexander Polyhistor, 76.

Alexander Zabinas, 65.

Alexandra, mother of Mariamme, 201.

Alexandria, 278 *sq.*; Roman government of, 281; its cosmopolitan population, and its Jews, 282; "mixed" marriages at, *ibid.*; character of the people, their oriental sympathies, 283; a centre of philosophic thought, 218; destined to be capital of Alexander's empire, 236; Hadrian visits it, 295; its epigrammatists, 427; *vide sub* Museum.

Alissandra of Epirus, 23.

Allegory, Stoic use of, to explain religious tenets, 362.

Amafinius, C., his text-book on Epicureanism, 100, 103.

Amitrochates, 21.

Ammonius, the successor of Aristarchus, 69.

Ammonius of Athens, his bequest praised by Plutarch, 385.

Amphiaraus, divinity of, 179.

Amphicrates, 122.

Amphictyons, at Delos, 186.

Amphitheatre: Herod's, at Jerusalem, 209; at Corinth, remains of an, questionable, 321.

Amynander, King, 344.

Anachoretes, Dion on the, 422.

Anacreontics, the, in the Greek *Anthology*, late, 433.

ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν τὴν πόλιν, 16.

Anaxagoras, 222.

Anaxandrides and Tryphera, 409.

Andros, battle of, 187.

ἀνιππεία, 45.

Anthology, the Greek, 427 *sq.*; quoted, 431, 432, 458, 459, 460.

Antigoneia, 268.

Antigoneia, at Delos, 187.

Antigonus, 130.

Antigonus Gonatas, effects of the victory at Cos and defeat at Andros of, shown at Delos, 187.

Antioch, 293 *sq.*; Strabo on, 294; its unfortunate site, *ibid.*; its petition to hold Olympic games, 309; decline of Hellenism at, 198.

Antiochus II, 21.

Antiochus III, 54.

Antiochus Cyzicenus, 65.

Antiochus Epiphanes, 293.

Antiochus Eusebes, 59.

Antiochus Grypus, 65.

Antiochus Magnus, 24, 60; settles Jews on the coast of Asia Minor, 316.

Antiochus Sidetes, 61, 64; his edict against philosophers, 86, 92.

Antiochus, robbed by Verres, 173.

Antiochus, the historian, 245.

Antiochus, the philosopher, 130.

Antiochus, the scholarch, 88, 151, 158.

Antipater of Sidon, the epigrammatist, 430, 433.

Antipater of Tyre, Cato's teacher, 193.

Antiphilus, the epigrammatist, 433.

Antiyaka (Antiochus Theos), 23.

Antonius, M., 307; estimation of his character, 196 *sq.*; his dealings with Parthia, 204.

Apamæa, 7, 266, 293.

Apellicon of Teos, Aristion's lieutenant: defeated at Delos, 126; his library, 127.

Apis, feast of the manifestation of, 236.

Apollo Didymæus, 83.

Apollodorus of Artemita, the *Chronographer*, 26, 82, 225.

Apollodorus, the Epicurean, 97.

Apollonia, 323.

Apollonius, Crassus' freedman, 157.

Apollonius, Plutarch's friend, 369.

Apollonius of Tyana: Philostratus' *Life of*, 217, 261; on the degeneracy of Greece, 297; *vide sub* Philostratus.

Apotheosis of Roman emperors, its effect on the minds of subject nations, 444.

Appian, 84, 113, 121; on Mithradates, 119.

Apuleius: his *Metamorphoses* not a historical document, 342; on Hypata and Thebes, 298, 344; on Corinth and Platæa, 345; on "wild men," 337; on Tithorea, 298.

Aquillius, M., 121, 124.

Arab conquest of the East, 16.

Aramaic, in Meleager's epigram, 430.

Arbitration, between the Cappadocian king, Ariarathes, and his subjects, 269.

Arcesilaus, 88.

Archelaus, general at Piræus, 121.

Archelaus, successor of Herod the Great, 210.

Archæological Survey, 29, 30, 31.

Archias, career of, 157.

Architecture: Indian, was it influenced by Greek designs? 26; Roman, influenced by that of Greece, 106.

Archytas, pseudo-, 215.

Aretas, 18.

Argos, the κοινόν at, 301.

Ariarathes of Cappadocia, 268.

Ariobarzanes Philopator, of Cappadocia, 359.

Aristarchus, the scholarch, teacher of Apollodorus, 82.

Aristion: at Athens, 121, 126; at Delos, 140.

Aristobulus, as a Hellenist, 66.

Aristocracy, absence of an, in the Greece of Plutarch's day, 386.

Aristomenes, 77, 84.

Aristonicus: his war with Rome, 9, 108, 148; his dreams of a new Heliopolis, 10.

Aristophanes: not appreciated by Plutarch, 379; nor Dion, 438; nor by the author of *On the Sublime*, 441.

Aristotle: on the dangers of extreme democracy, 13; fate of his manuscripts, 127; his *Problems*, 131.

Arsaces of Parthia, 24.

Arsacid dynasty, its oriental character, 205.

Arsinoe, 238, 239.

Art, the result of training, not spontaneous, 390.

Art treasures: sold by Greek communities, 174; stolen by Romans, 277.

Artemidorus, of Ephesus, 76, 225, 228.

Artillery, effect of, on barbarians, 116.

Artorius, Augustus' physician, 359.

Ascalon, 66.

Asceticism of the first century, *vide* chap. ix.

Asia Minor: becomes centre of Hellenism, 118; wealth of, 120; its communal life fostered by Rome, 128; beneficence of Roman emperors towards, 271; earthquakes in, 405; grades in communal liberty in, 406.

Asianic: cities, mythical genealogies of, 267; Hellenism, extolled by Dion at the expense of European Hellas, 297; oratory, 438; of Antony, 297.

ἄσκησις, 438.

Ass, the, of the pseudo-Lucian, 347.

Assizes, Roman, a financial asset in civic communities, 269, 413.

Astronomy, Indian, influenced by Hellenic science, 38.

Ath. Mitth. (*Mittheilungen des deutschen Institut in Athen*), 196, 252, 271, 323, 365, 369, etc.

Atheism, lenient view of, in Plutarch, 367.

Athenæus, 61, 62, 121, 127; on the expulsion of Alcius and Philiscus, 92.

Athenio, 9.

Athenion (?), 121; *vide sub* Aristion.

Athenodorus: at Delos, 140; his meeting with Cato Junior, 193.

Athens: violates territory of Oropus, 94; receives exceptional treatment from Rome, 125; damage suffered from Sulla much exaggerated, 127; its condition during the last days of the Republic, 189; its poverty, 195; its degeneracy, according to Dion, 296, 401; the capital of universities, 314; St. Paul's visit, 318; cosmopolitan character of its inhabitants, 377.

Athos, monks of Mount, 300.

Attalia, 239.

Attalus III, his bequest of Pergamus to Rome, 9, 134.

Attalus Philadelphus, 397; the patron of Apollodorus, 82; founds Attalia, 239.

Atticus, Pomponius: takes the pictures of Sicyon in discharge of his debts, 174; his estates in Greece, 318.

Augusta Emerita (Merida), 232.

Augustan gods, 272.

Augustus: wore Roman dress, 147; his dealings with Herod, 209; his age one of Roman rather than Greek culture, 224; his failure to check the national decay in Greece, 301; his Greek education, *ibid.*; worship of, 402; his rescript to the Cnidians, 409; quoted, 456.

Auletes, King, and Rabirius, 147.

Azas, coins of, found at Taxila, 31.

Bacchæ, the, of Euripides, 35.

Bacchanalibus, Senatus consultum de, 91.

Bacchias and Karanis, coins found at, 289.

Bactria: revolt of, 21; later kingdom of, 25; the capital of, a great trade centre, 22.

Baedecker's *Greece*, 154.

Bætis, settlements along the, 231.

Baiæ, 247.

Balbus, conquers Spain, 229.

Barbarians: and Cimmerian Bosphorus, 115, 323; admitted to citizenship at Borysthenes, *ibid.*

Basilis, 76.

Beaudouin (in *BCH.*), on the fusion of Medeon and Stiris, 130.

Benefactions, from richer to poorer citizens, 311.

Benevolences, granted by Egyptian kings, 52.

Beni-Hassan, columns at, 30.

Benseler, on Plutarch's style, 382.

Bent, Th., *Cyclades*, 270.

Berenice, inscription from, 257.

Berlin Conference, effect of the result of, on the Italian people, 412.

Berlin Papyri, 290.

Berœa, Jews at, 317.

Berytus, Agrippa's theatre at, 418.

Bevan, *House of Seleucus*, 60, 203, 293.

Bilingual: decrees of the governors in the East, 205; inscriptions in Magna Græcia, 249.

Bithynia: federal council of, 271; the Greeks of, not pure Hellenes, 416; Christians in, 400, 445.

Blass, *Attische Beredsamkeit*, 441.

Blossius of Cumæ, friend of Tib. Gracchus, 103, 148.

Boethus of Sidon, 101.

Bogos, king of Mauretania, 73.

Bossier, G., *Ciceron et ses amis*, 144.

Boissonade, violates the law of the bucolic cæsura, 428.

Book-worms, attacks on, 433, 459.

Borysthenes, life on the, described by Dion, 322 *sq.*

Bosphore cimmérien, Antiquités du, 114.

Bosphorus, the Cimmerian: Greek settlements on, 114; democratical institution of, 116; it was never part of a Hellenistic kingdom, 117.

Botti, on Alexandria, 281.

Boundaries, disputes concerning, 299.

Brandes, F., 37.

Brown, *Lake Mœris*, 42.

Brundusium, 245.

Bruttius (Latin rhetorician), 153.

Brutus: at Athens 191; estimation of his character, 192.

Bucolic cæsura, the law of, violated by Boissonade, 428.

Buddha Gaya, Açoka's railings at, 29.

Buddhism: spread by Açoka, 21-23; missionaries of, 221.

Buddhists, Açoka's synod of, 22.

BCH. (*Bulletin du correspondence hellénique*), 116, 117, 119, 136, 138, 140, 141, 178, 205, 215, 254, 258, 264, 280, 360, 365, 377.

Burke, Edmund, on party government, 352.

Bury, J. B., *Later Roman Empire*, 287.

Butler, Bishop, on punishment for sin, compared with Plutarch, 363.

Byzantium, 205; racing factions at, 286; its status under Roman rule, 406.

Cæcilius, the rhetor, 440, 441.

Cære, 244.

Cæsar: overthrow of oligarchy by, 14; his designs against the Parthians, 204; his dislike of Greek shallowness, 190.

Cæsar Augusta (Saragossa), 232.

Cæsar Lacon, 307.

Cæsarea, in Mauretania, 256.

Cæsarea: rebuilt and adorned by Herod, 209, 211; conflict of Jews and Greeks at, 419.

Cæsaria, 309.

Cæsarian age, the, marked by revival in Greek literature, 244.

Calenus, 191.

Caligula, 302, 308; the embassy from Alexandrian Jews to, 409; *vide sub* Philo.

Callimachus, the father of the epigram, 427.

Callisthenes, pseudo-, 70.

Callistratus, the Borysthenite, 324.

Calymnæ, kings at, 116.

Camillus, to whom Philip of Thessalonica dedicated his anthology, 433.

Cannanore, Roman coins found at, 313.

Cantabri, astonishment of the, at Roman officers taking walking exercise, 231.

Capitals, specimens of Greek, found in India, 30.

Capitolina, 306, 309.

Cappadocians, refuse a democratic polity, 129, 269.

Capua, spoils of, 133.

Carian League, and Mithradates, 118.

Carneades: his *Doctrine of Probability*, 98; as ambassador at Rome, 88, 94, 95; personally friendly to Diogenes, 97.

Carthage: Strabo's account of, 256; fertility of its territory, 4; its slaves, 6.

Carthagena, the great mine at, 231.

Carystos: marble quarries of, 313; meeting of populace at, 329.

Casamicciola, 252.

Casander, 315.

Cassino, Monte, abbot of, 263.

Cassiterides, 229.

Cassius, a sentimental republican, an actual tyrant, 194.

Cassius Dionysius, translator of Mago's text-book, 5.

Cato Maior, 103; inconsistency of his opposition to Greek philosophy, 96; on public endearments, 333; on the common origin of Rome and Hellas, 436.

Cato Minor: his encounter with King Deiotarus, 152; estimation of his character, 193.

Celænæ, Dion Chrysostom's account of, 270.

Celtiberia: mineral wealth of, 229 *sq.*; rabbits, plague of in, 230.

Chæremon, the librarian, 280.

Chæronea, tragedy of, 184 *sq.*

Chandragupta, 19, 20, 21.

Chariot, in Indian sculpture, 29.

Chastity, Plutarch on, 396, 397.

Chaucer's anecdotes, compared with those in Apuleius, 348.

Cheerfulness, duty of, 395.

Chelcias and Ananias mercenary captains in Cleopatra III's service, 66, 69.

Chersonesus, 143.

Chians: their hard treatment at hands of Mithradates, 119; their political privileges, 407.

Children: exposing of, 373; treatment and education of, 374 *sq.*

Chio, earthquake at, 262.

Choachytæ, 48.

χρηματισταί (assize judges in Egypt), 48.

Christianity: probable reference to it in Plutarch, 378; its beginnings and literature unnoticed by contemporary Greek writers, 400, 443; in Bithynia, 400, 445; its indebtedness to Greece, 443; Roman domination the medium of its propagation, 444.

Cicero, M. T., chap. vii, 144 *sq.*; on Mago's book of agriculture, 5; on Philodemus of Gadara, 160, 431; on Panætius and Polybius and philosophy at Rome, 93; on the embassy of the Greek scholarchs, 94, 95; his *de officiis* is largely drawn from Panætius, 102; his kindness to Dionysius, 108; repudiates the reputation of a connoisseur, 133, 156, 171; a trimmer in politics, 144; the first master of Latin prose, 145; the creator of philosophic Latin prose, *ibid.;* his poetry, 146; his *de oratore* derived from Greek authorities, 149, 170; his teachers, 150; the education of his son and nephew, 151; his visit to Greece, *ibid.;* his indifference to the picturesque of that country, 154; on the Greek view of perjury, 165, 396; a seeming slight on his Greek correspondents, 167; on funeral inscriptions, 259; on complimentary statues, 358; on the limits to ridicule and jesting, 392; his works commented on, or cited: *Acad. prior.*, 96, 156; *pro Archia*, 156, 157, 170; *ad Atticum*, 151, 168; *pro Balbo*, 180, 246; *Brutus*, 170; *Cato Minor*, 152; *de rege Deiotaro*, 6; *ad familiares*, 151, 154, 156, 157, 176, 181, 218; *pro Flacco*, 167, 176, 259; *de finibus*, 155, 181; *pro lege Gabinia*, 140, 186; *de legg.*, 182; *pro Ligario*, 170; *pro lege Manilia*, 175, 176; *pro Murena*, 181, 182; *de natura deorum*, 151, 179; *de officiis*, 102, 187; *orator*, 181; *de oratore*, 149, 358; *in Pisonem*, 158, 176; *Philip.*, 170; *ad Quintum fratrem*, 168, 170; *pro Rabirio Post.*, 146, 171; *pro Scauro*, 16; *pro Sestio*, 175; *pro Sulla*, 170; *ad Titinium*, 149; *Tusc. quaestt.*, 93, 100, 164, 168, 170; *in Vatinium*, 181; *in Verrem*, 147, 163, 163, 171.

Cichorius, Conrad, *Rom und Mytilene*, 302, 357, 407.

Cilicia, a hot-bed of Stoicism, 86.

Cimmerian Bosphorus, 322; its trade suffers from the Macedonian conquest, 115; *vide* also *sub* Bosphorus.

Cirta, 256.

Cities, Greek: their special privileges, 17; their curtailed ambitions, 295; in inner Asia, 202; in Syria and Palestine, 63, 202; of the Syrian coast, 62, 237; names of, 68; in Egypt, 238; old and new, 267.

Citizenship: Greek, conferred on Romans, 190; Roman, its exclusiveness, *ibid.*

Çiva and Dionysus, 37, 38.

Claudius, the first Hellenistic emperor, 303.

Cleanthes, 222.

Cleomenes (Verres' tool), 164.

Cleon, the bandit-priest, 264.

Cleon of Cilicia, 7.

Cleon Siculus, 83.

Cleopatra II, 52.

Cleopatra III, at Ptolemais, 66.

Cleopatra VI, 199 *sq.*, 288; cosmopolitan character of her court, 202; her personal appearance, 199; her transactions with Herod, *ibid.*, 207; with Antony, 197; with Octavian, 201; a linguist, 282.

Cleruchs, in Hellenistic settlements in Egypt, 45.

Clinton's *Fasti*, 86.

Clitomachus, the scholarch, 98.

Cnidos, Augustus' rescript to the magistrates of, 409; quoted, 456.

Cobet, on Lucian's style, 382, 435.

Coinage, Hellenistic, not a certain proof of Hellenistic civilisation, 26.

Colonies: Hellenistic, isolation of, 39; Roman, of veterans settled in the East, 205; military, a feature of the ancient Persian régime, 235.

Colonisation: under the early Roman Empire, *vide* chap. x; Roman methods of, based on Alexander's system, 236; Greek, limitations of, 233, 235; Phœnician capacity for, 283.

Columella on Mago, 5.

Comana: priest-rulers of, 263; Cleon, the bandit-priest of, 264.

Comedy, Greek, at Rome, 109 *sq.*

Commercial jealousy of the Romans, 138.

Communal Hellenism in Asia Minor, 129.

Community of goods, practised by Essenes, 220.

Como, Greeks settled at, by J. Cæsar, 190.

Comparetti, on Piso's (?) villa at Herculaneum, 160.

Complimentary: decrees, extraordinary frequency of, 311; statues, 358.

Confederacies, in Hellenic Greece, 130.

Conversation: subjects for, at dinner, 389; tact in, 390.

Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Travels of St. Paul*, 316.

Cooking, Greek, 386.

Copais, Lake, tunnelling to lower, 308.

Corduba, 231 *sq.*; *patois* of, 170.

Corinth, 296, 301; destruction of, due to Delian jealousy, 138; its restoration, 141; Roman colonists at, 190; its courtezan-priestesses, 263; St. Paul at, 319; Hertzberg on, criticised, *ibid.*; Apuleius' account of, 345.

Corinthian pillars, employed in Herod's temple, 210.

Cornelia, letters of, 110.

CIA., 359, etc.

CIG. (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*), 338, 359, etc.

CIL. (*Corpus Inscriptionum Lati rum*), 117, 260, 262, etc.

Cos, battle of, 187.

Cosmetæ, the, 377.

Cosmopolitanism: inculcated by philosophers, 98; in Plutarch, 403.

Cotta (the orator), 150.

Country life: attractions of, 337; the ideal life according to Dion, 422.

Cousin (in *BCH.*), 178, 180.

Crassus: with Antonius, the founder of the great school of Roman orators, 110; his knowledge of Greek culture, 148; his edict against Latin rhetoricians, 149.

Cratippus, the Peripatetic, 193; Cicero Junior intimate with him, 153.

Cretan war, 186.

Crimea, Greek settlements in the, 113, etc.

Crinagoras, the epigrammatist, 357, 407, 433; on the Roman colonists at Corinth, 190; his observance of the laws of the Greek epigram, 427 *sq.*; the character of his poems, 432; quoted, *ibid.*

Crinagoras of Mytilene, his mission in company of Potamon, 272, 302.

Critolaus and Diogenes, 95.

Crocodilopolis, 43.

Croiset (in *Littérature grecque*), on the anacreontic poems in the *Anthology*, 434.

Crusius, Professor O., *Herondas and Other Mimes*, 80.

Ctesiphon, the Parthian royal residence, 59.

Cumæ: date of the foundation of, 246; migration of populace of, to Neapolis, 248.

Cunningham, General (*Archæological Survey*), 29, 30, 31.

Cunningham Memoirs, 43.

Cybele, rites of, adopted by Greeks, 214.

Cyclades, as residences for exiles, 404.

Cynics, the superficiality of their open air preaching, 425.

Cyrene, described by Strabo, 256 *sq.*

Cythera, 307.

Cytheris, 181.

Damon, 184.

Dancing, degrading for a Roman, 181.

Daphnis and Chloe, 292.

Daulis, its dispute concerning boundaries, 299 *sq.*

Decamerone, Apuleius' novel compared with the, 343.

Deiotarus: Diophanes' epitome of Mago dedicated to, 5, 6; the character of his court, 152.

Deistic creed, of Dion Chrysostom, 278.

Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles*, 219.

Delmarre, Professor, on the inscription to Philokles, 137.

Delos: Athenian commercial jealousy of, 123; intercourse of Greeks and Romans at, 126, French School of Exploration at, 135, 253; Spartan control over, 136; Romans at, 138; the free port of the Ægean, 138, 139; a great slave-mart, *ibid.*; ἐπιμεληταί, 139; a stepping-stone for Roman trade to Asia, *ibid.*; temples to foreign deities at, *ibid.*; Aristion at, 140; its populace philo-Roman, *ibid.*; Sulla's treatment of, *ibid.*; Athenodorus at, *ibid.*, 187; Mithradates at, *ibid.*; its guild of *Pompeiastæ*, *ibid.*; as a religious centre, 214.

Delphi: its dispute with Amphissa and Anticyra, 300; decay of its oracle, 370.

Demagogues, disappearance of the ancient type of, 353.

Demetrius Callatianus, 76, 83.

Demetrius, Cicero's teacher, 151.

Demetrius Soter, 59.

Democratic constitutions: under titular kings, 116; Plutarch's opinion of, 351.

Democritus, the philosopher, 213.

Democritus of Sicyon, intimate with Cicero, 168.

Demons: Plutarch's doctrine of, 362; Dionysius reserves his judgment on, 437; cf. the Pythagorean view, 216.

Demosthenes: *in Leptinem*, 114; *Epistles*, 441; Dion on, 438.

Dentheliatæ, ager, dispute concerning, 299.

Deportment, Plutarch on, 374.

Descartes and Spinoza, attacked by clerics, 98.

Deschamps (in *BCH.*), 178.

Diadochi, common ambition of the, 1.

Diæus, host of Aristion, 124.

Diaspora, the, of the Jews, 417.

Dicæarchia, 246.

Diehl (in *BCH.*), 180.

Digest, quoted, 78.

Dill, Professor, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 366.

Dinner parties: Plutarch on, 384 *sq.*; etiquette at, *ibid.*

Diodorus: life of, 224; quoted, 3 (on Roman degeneracy), 7, 8, 9, 77 (on his indebtedness to Agatharchides and Photius), 78, 198.

Diodotus, satrap of Sogdiana, revolt of, 22.

Diodotus, the Stoic, Cicero's instructor and friend, 150, 157.

Diogenes of Antioch, the Epicurean, 61.

Diogenes Laertius, 86, 98, 99, 100; attributes the doctrine of demons to the Stoics, 362.

Diogenes the Stoic, teacher of Apollodorus, 82, 94.

Dion, Cassius, 66.

Dion Chrysostom of Prusa, 117, 164, 261, 294; his life and character, 265; on civic genealogies, 267; on Celænæ, 270; on Tarsus, 273; on Rhodes, 275; on the street manners of the Rhodians, 277; his deism, 278; on the Fellows at Alexandria, 285; on Athenian degeneracy, 296, 401; honoured by Hadrian, 307; on gladiatorial games at Athens, 320; *on Poverty*, 322; *Olympica*, 323; the *Hunter*, 326; his rhetorical exaggerations, 337; his advice to the rival factions of Prusa, 355; his gift of a *Stoa* to Prusa, 412; on the universality of Homer's sentiments, 421; on the ideal character of a country life, 422; on the character of contemporary philosophers, 426; on the subjects of a liberal education, 438.

Dionysiac guild of actors, 214, 309; in India, 35; their treatment by Aristion, 124; at Neapolis, 249.

Dionysius, envoy to Vindusara, 21.

Dionysius, tutor of Cicero Junior, 108, 168.

Dionysius of Chalcis, 83.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 244, 434; his life and writings, 435 *sq.*; his ambition of reconciling Greek and Roman traditions, 436; his appreciation of the earlier classical writers, 438; compared with Longinus, 441.

Dionysius of Syracuse, writings of, used by Strabo, 256.

Dionysius Thrax (the grammarian), 110.

Dionysus, Mithradates styled, 124.

Diophanes of Bithynia, epitome of Mago by, 5.

Diophantus (Mithradates' general), 323; honorary inscription to, 116.

Discord, civil: Plutarch on, 352 *sq.*; Dion on, 355 *sq.*

Discursive thought, despised by Essenes and Neo-Pythagoreans, 220.

Dittenberger (*Sylloge*), 115, 118, 137, 258, 309.

Divine honours, attributed to emperors and governors, 354.

Dolabella, at Argos, 191.

Domitian: establishes his Capitoline games, 306; his encouragements to libraries, *ibid.*

Doric tribes, the, Hylleis, Dymanes, and Pamphyli, at Cos, Calymnæ, and Nemea, recorded in inscriptions, 365.

Dörpfeld, W., (in *Ath. Mitth.*), 126, 305.

Dorylaus, the strategist, 119.

Drama, Indian, 33 *sq.*; a by-effect of Hellenism, 34.

Dress, Greek, adopted by Romans, 125, 146, 180, 302, 306.

Dress of philosophers, Dion on, 426.

Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 16, 77.

Drunkenness, recognised as hereditary disease, by Plutarch, 373.

Dublin, works of Italian stucco artists in, 134.

Dumont, A. (in *BCH.*), on Athenian *ephebi*, 377.

Duruy, *History of Rome*, 121.

Dyme, democratic revolution of, 127; pirates at, 186.

Earthquakes: a cause of great loss in Asia Minor, 262, 405; at Antioch, 294.

Eastern cults, adopted by Hellenism, 401.

Eclecticism, in Hellenistic philosophy, 89, 98, 99, 100, 213, 377.

Edict: against Latin pedants who imitated Greek professors, 110, 149; of Antiochus Sidetes, 110.

Education: neglected at Rome, 107 *sq.*; for imperial duties, 108; higher, confined to Scipionic circle, 3; Greece as a provider of, 314.

Egypt: dissemination of Hellenism in, 41; Ptolemaic, compared with Roman, 198, 289; senators excluded from, 284; officials in, 68, 289.

Egyptian: reaction against Hellenism, 15; deities, worshipped in Greek settlements, 44; foundations, distinguished from Syrian, 67; husbandmen degenerate into mere ryots, 202; ornaments, at Pompeii, 252; populace, in Strabo's time, 281.

Elephants: traffic in, 78; killed by Troglodytes, 79; at Rome, 457.

Elton, *Origins of English History*, 229.

Embassies: of provincials to Rome, 357 *sq.*; badly treated by their ungrateful fellow-citizens, 412.

Emporiæ, 228.

Emperor, increased supervision by the Roman, in Pliny's time, 445.

Epicureanism: modified and adopted by Roman populace, tionalistic aspect regarding in, 362; Cicero's hostility to, 1

Epicureans: (Alcius and Ph banished from Rome, 92; sus because of their non-politica tude, 97.

Epicurus, had no real successor school, 101.

οἱ τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, 45.

Epigram, the laws of the Greel *vide sub* Crinagoras, Meleage Philippus.

ἐπιμελητής (Roman high commiss at Delos), 139.

Epistles, of Plato and Demosth 441.

Epistolographi Græci, 441.

Epitaph, laudatory Latin, quoted

Epitomes, 5, 76, 81; of Apollodorus

Eratosthenes, the geographer, 83; S bo's use of, 225.

ἐργαστῖναι, lists of the, 365.

Erotici scriptores, 292, 343.

Erymæus, the scholarch, 122.

Essenes, 213 *sq.*; Josephus on the, books of, 220; relation of, to B dhism, 221.

Eternity of the world: maintained Zeno and Boethus, 101; denied Panætius, 102.

Ethical teaching of Neo-Pythagor ism, 216.

Eubœa, described by Dion, 326 *sq.*

Eubulus, inquiry into death of, 40

Eucratides, founds Eucratideia, 25

Eudemus, 19.

Florus, Gessius, his appointment leads to the great Jewish war, 419.

Florus, L. Mestrius, petition to, from the Ephesians, 272.

Fortifications, existing in Dion's time at Rhodes, 275.

Foucart, M., *Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, 179.

Foundations, royal, 239, 240; Egyptian and Syrian, 67.

Franchise: property, at Tarsus, 274; Plutarch's condemnation of universal, 351.

Franciscans, a mediæval parallel to the itinerant lay preachers of the Roman Empire, 286.

Frazer's edition of Pausanias, 365.

Free port of the Ægean, Delos as the, 138, 139.

Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, on gladiatorial shows, 321; criticised, 342.

φυλακίδες (guard-ships against pirates), 138.

Gabinius, 206.

Gadara, *vide sub* Philodemus and Meleager.

Gades, trade and wealth of, 229.

Gallus, Ælius: and Strabo, 226; his visit to the statue of Memnon, 279.

Gardener, P., *Bactrian Coins*, 25.

Gaul, Cisalpine, a source of the Roman meat supply, 244.

Gaza, 62, 203; its destruction fatal to environing Hellenism, 66.

Gellius, L., his advice to philosophers, 182.

Genealogies of Asiatic cities, falsified, 267.

Geography: interest in, 69; metrical treatises on, 81.

Gerizim, Mount, worship at, 65.

Germanicus, his epigrams, 433.

Gessius Florus, 419.

Gesticulation, excessive, of Greeks, 171.

Getæ, the, 323, 426.

Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, on the effects of imperial domination, 447.

Glabrio, M. Acilius, 300.

Gladiatorial games: at Corinth, 320; condemned by Greek writers, 321.

Godhead, unity of the, 349, 361.

Gods, statues of Greek, in the temples of Egyptian divinities, 252.

Goethe, imitates Meleager, 432.

Gold, export of, from the West to the East, 313.

Göll, criticised, 342.

Governors, rapacity of Roman, 175.

Gracchi, the: their Hellenistic sympathies suspected, 148; Caius' attempt at colonisation, 5; his speeches, 110; Tiberius, 103.

Grammarians, the Hellenistic, 426.

Gréard, O., *La morale de Plutarque*, 367; on sophistical treatises, 368.

Greece, European: decay of, 129; its social severance from Asia Minor, 400.

Greek language: its failure to displace vernaculars, 16; at first spoken correctly in the Fayyum, 46; the language of the Egyptian nationalist, 54; an official language in the East, 111, 204; unpopularity of Greek-speaking Romans, 147; as a world-language, 157; an official language at Neapolis, 249; rarely mastered by Jews, 417.

Greeks: influenced at Memphis by Egyptian ideas, 51; their grievances and privileges in Mesopotamia, 59; in Syria and Palestine, 60, 62; influx of artists and professors to Rome, 92, 314; Latin translations of their classics, 109; their culture checked at Rome by intestine troubles, 112; their exceptional treatment at the hands of the Romans, 120; Roman contempt for them, 162 *sq.*; their condition under Roman rule, 166; intimacy with them not desirable for a Roman governor, 168; Romans despise their love of art, 175; revival of their literary studies, 243 *sq.*; their civilisation in Asia Minor compared with that of Rome, 263; degeneracy of their literary style in Plutarch's time, 382; fall short of the ideal gentleman, 393; massacres of, by Jews, 419.

Grenfell and Hunt, *Fayyum Towns and Their Papyri*, 42, 44, 55, 80, 281, 290.

"Grouting," in Greek dinner parties, 388.

Growse, F. S. (in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*), 29.

Guides and guide-books, for tourists in Hellenistic regions, 76.

Gurob, Flinders Petrie's discoveries at, 42.

Hadrian: his visit to Alexandria, [illegible] his age the culminating point of Hellenistic revival, 306, 421.

Hair, dyeing of, by Herod, 199.

Hamilcar, 233.

[illegible]

Helico, Caligula's freedman, uses his influence in favour of Alexandrian Greeks, 410.

Heliopolis, Egyptian, 280.

Hellas: decay of, 312; its degeneracy according to Dion, 296.

Hellenism: protest of, against Roman brutality, 11; spread by city foundations, 16; origin of Roman, 17; national reactions against, *ibid.*; in the East, 19; checked by Buddhism, 23; in Upper Egypt, 40 *sq.*; as affected by the Mithradatic wars, 113; its oriental aspects, 131; appreciated by Mithradates, 143; reaction of Rome against, 107, 147.

Hellenistic: empire, last portions of, absorbed by Rome, 15; cities, special privileges of, 17; their curtailed ambitions, 295; fashions, unpopular at Rome, 107, 147; countries, greatly oppressed during the last days of the Roman republic, 189.

Hellenomemphites, 238.

Heraclea, founds Chersonesus, 116.

Heracles, the ideal of the Cynics, 337.

Heracleitus, 213.

Heras, the athlete, epigram of Philip of Thessalonica on, quoted, 460.

Herculaneum, 248, 254 *sq.*; literary remains found at, 255.

"Heresy," meaning of the term, 220.

Hermaistæ, guild of, at Delos, 139.

Hermathena, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 55.

Hermes, 179.

Herod the Great, 206 *sq.*, 416; restores Greek cities in Syria and Palestine, 67; his encounter with Cleopatra, 199; his *Memoirs* used by Josephus, *Iliad*, opening line of, faulty according to the epigrammatists, 428.

Ilium, Roman, 266, 407.

Immortality of the soul, denied by Panætius, 102.

Impostors, philosophic, 121 *sq.*

Impresario, in Indian drama, 38.

Improvements, architectural, unpopular, 412 *sq.*

India, of Megasthenes, 20.

Indians: their architects did not learn the use of stone from Greeks, 27; their designs are original, 29; their knowledge of the Greek language, 32; their embassies to Augustus, *ibid.*; their drama, 33 *sq.*; a by-effect of Hellenism, 34; use of a non-vernacular language, 35; *impresario* and prologue, 38; their astronomy, 38; their religions: English policy regarding, 264; their trade, Sinope an emporium for, 268.

Inn-keepers, Italian, rapacity of, 357.

Innovations, in religion, not due to the older centres of Hellenistic culture, 223.

Inscriptions: on Diophantus, 116; at Delos, 135; falsification of, 155; bilingual, 249; on M. Titius, from the Jews of Cyrenaica, 257; funeral, 258 *sq.*; their deficiencies as historical records, 257; on Tiberius, 262; laudatory, 259, 309, 358; desired by semi-Hellenistic dynasts, 359; on the "simple life" at Naples, 338; *vide sub Ath. Mitth.*, *BCH.*, *CIG.*, *CIL.*

Interpreters, to help Romans in Greek localities, 147.

Invitations, long, 384.

Iphigenia in Tauris, parodied, 80.

ἱππόσκοποι, 45.

Ipsus, elephants at, 20.

Irish: problem, compared with that of Egyptian natives, 53; parallel, to Gellius' advice to philosophers, 183; epitaph, quoted to illustrate Greek laudatory inscriptions, 259.

Isauria, 205.

Ischia, 252.

Isis: temple of, at Pompeii, 252, 361; worship of, by Greeks, 361, 366, 401.

Iskandar (Candahar), 236.

Ἰσολυμπικά, feast of the Neapolitans, 249.

Isthmus, Nero's project of a canal through the, 320.

Italiot cities, failure of, to win over Apulians and Samnites, 235.

John's Jahrbücher, 77.

Jannæus, Alexander, 66.

Jason of Pheræ, the dictum of, 353.

Jealousies, civic, in Asia Minor, 269, 415 *sq.*

Jerusalem, adorned by Herod, 209, 418.

Jests, how far permissible at social parties, 389, 392.

Jews: in Syria, 62, 63; their concessions to Hellenism, 64, 65; under Herod, 209 *sq.*; at Berenice, 257; in Egypt, 282; in Hellas and Macedonia, 316; the audience whom St. Paul addresses in Macedonia, 317; did not mix in good society in Greece, 371; Plutarch's ignorance of their religion, 371; their embassy to Caligula, 410; and *vide sub* Philo; their jealousy of the Greeks, 416, 418; their *diaspora*, 417; measured by Greeks, 419.

Jobbery in public works, 415 *sq.*

John Hyrcanus, 62.

Josephus, quoted or referred to, 59, 63, 64, 65, 67, 194, 196, 199, 200, 201, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 303, 307, 418, 419.

Juba, King, 256.

Judas Maccabæus, 63.

Judicial arrangements, in Greek settlements in Egypt, 48.

Justin, 25, 26.

Juvenal, on the atrocities of Ombi and Tentyra, 287.

Kaibel (*IGSI.*), 338; on Philodemus of Gadara, 161, 427, 428.

κάτοικοι, 45, 52, 55.

Keil, *Sylloge Inscript. Bœot.*, 308.

Kerkeosiris, 56.

Kermesse, the modern, analogous to the Greek *panegyris*, 270.

Kertch, treasures from, 114.

Kings, titular, of Cimmerian Bosphorus, 116.

Kissing as a form of salutation, out of fashion, 333.

Klea, the priestess of Isis, 342, 361.

κοινά, in Hellenistic Greece, 130.

κοινὸν τῶν Ἀθαμάνων, 130.

κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν, 136.

Korope, oracle of Apollo at, 369.

Laberius' retort to Cicero, 145.

Labienus, ravages Caria, 226.

Lælius, 102, 109.

Lagina, inscription of, 118.

Land: grants of, for military service, 55; difficulties, in Greece, where grazing was taking the place of agriculture, 331.

Laodicea, 293.

λαοί and μάχιμοι, in Hellenistic settlements in Egypt, 45.

Lassen, Ch., *Indische Alterthumskunde*, 20, 34, 38; criticised, 26.

Latifundia, in Greece, 298.

Latin: as a medium for philosophic thought, 145; more spoken at Puteoli than Greek, 250; laudatory inscription quoted, 260.

Latinisms, in Greek decrees of the Senate, 180.

Latischev (in *BCH.*), 178.

Laurium, mines of, 231; worked by slave labour, 11; exhausted, 313.

Le Bas and Waddington (*Inscriptions*), 309.

Lecky, W. H., *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, on party government, 352.

Lecture-room: picture of a Greek, at Rome, 350; terms of applause in, 379; behaviour in, 383.

Lectures, On Proper Conduct at, Plutarch's, quoted, 380.

Left hand, impropriety of using the, 374.

Letronne (*La statue vocale de Memnon*), 280.

Letters, etiquette of, in Egypt, 58.

Leucon, despot on the Cimmerian Bosphorus, 114.

Liberty of the Greeks, 304, 314, 453; variations in the terms of, in Asiatic cities, 406.

Library of Apellicon of Teos, transferred to Rome, 127.

Ligarius, prosecution of, by Tubero, 170.

Ligurian pirates and freebooters, Roman struggle with, 241.

Lions, at Megara, 191.

Liparæan islands, Strabo's account of, drawn from Antiochus, 245.

Literature: at Rome, 109; Greek, degeneracy in style in, 382.

Literature of the first century, 421 *sq.*; Hadrian the culminating point of the revival of, *ibid.*; tendency to superficiality of, 424; severance of grammarians and authors, 426; the Greek *Anthologies*, 427; the laws of the Greek epigram, *ibid.*; Meleager, 430 *sq.*; Crinagoras, 432; Philip of Thessalonica, 433; Nicolaus Damascenus, 435; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 435; his intention and its absurdities, 436 *sq.*; his appreciation of the earlier classical writers, 438; Dion Chrysostom on subjects for literary studies, *ibid.*; a literature of erudition, 442.

Livy, 90, 178; on the petition of Cumæ to the Senate, 248.

Loans, forced, advocated by Pliny, 445.

Local self-government: absence of, in Egypt, 54; granted under Roman supervision, 208; admission of, a defect in Alexander's scheme of empire, 237; yet adopted by Romans, 238; a failure in Hellenistic communities, 314.

Lolling, on an inscription from Korope, 369.

[Longinus], *On the Sublime*, 244, 434; a reaction to Atticism, 439; on the stagnation in Greek life and literature under the empire, 446 *sq.*

Lovers, jests at, Plutarch on, 393.

Lucania, Strabo's account of, 245.

Lucian, his style not pure according to Cobet, 382, 434.

Lucian's, pseudo-, *Ass*, 347.

Lucilius: the first original Latin poet, 108, 110, 181; receives the dedication of one of Clitomachus' books, 99.

Lucius, Apuleius' metamorphosis of, 343 *sq.*

Lucius of Patræ, Metamorphosis of, the original of Lucian's *Ass* and Apuleius' romance, 347.

Lucretius: as Epicurean teacher, 100; as poet, 103, 104; with Cicero the pioneer in introducing Greek philosophy to the Romans, 106.

Lucullus, 117; saves Chæronea, 185.

Lycia, cities founded by kings in, 240.

Lysias: his *tenue genus* criticised by Plutarch, 382; Dion Chrysostom on, 438; Cæcilius and [Longinus] on, 440.

Lysimachia, 239.

Lysimachus, refounds Nicæa, 268.

Lysippus' statue of Heracles, 133.

Lyso and Cicero, 168.

Maccabees, the, 62; their Hellenistic traits, 63.

Macchiavelli (*Principe*), advocates justice in trifles, injustice in important matters, 353.

Macedonian conquest, and Cimmerian Bosphorus, 114.

Macedonia, St. Paul's visit to, 315.

μάχιμοι, 45, 55.

Maga of Cyrene, 23.

Magna Græcia: Hellenism in, *vide* chap. xi; decay of cities of, 245.

Magnesia: inscription from, to Tiberius, 262; strike of bakers at, 272.

Mago, book on agriculture by, 5, 81.

Mâhabhârata, the allusion in, to early stone structures in India, 27.

Mahaffy, J. P., works of, cited: *Alexander's Empire*, 117; *Art of Conversation*, 259; *Empire of the Ptolemies*, 60, 137, 401; *Greek Classical Literature*, 104; *Greek Life and Thought*, 4, 20, 24, 25, 86, 92, 95, 96, 115, 124, 126, 131, 133, 137, 167, 235, 237, 240, 268, 281, 292, 299, 316, 337, 380; *Rambles and Studies in Greece*, 229, 324; *Social Life in Greece*, 234.

Mallus and Tarsus, 273.

Manners, good, laudations of, 258.

Marble, Greek trade in, 298.

Marcellus, and the spoils of Syracuse, 133.

Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus, his epigrams, 433.

Mariamme, 207 *sq.*; insulted by her mother, 201.

Marion, Cassius' lieutenant in Syria, 194.

Marius' ignorance of Greek culture, 132.

Marriages: of courtesans, a Hellenic trait in Indian drama, 33; "mixed," in Egypt, 53; at Alexandria, 282; rustic, described, 335 *sq.*

Maspero, Professor, quoted, 238.

Massanassa, of Numidia, 141.

Massilia: Greek centre in the West, 117; Hellenic, not Hellenistic, 228; a seat of higher education for Romans, 240.

Mazaca, 268.

Medeon and Stiris, fusion of, 130.

Mediation in philosophy, Cicero's protest against, 183.

Mediterranean, Romans destined to be masters of the, 12.

Megara: kings at, 116; lions let loose at, by the besieged, 191.

Megasthenes: author of *Indica*, envoy to Sandracottus, 20, 225; on the walls of Palimbothra, 28.

Melanthius, on Athenian party quarrels, 352.

Meleager of Gadara: his epigrams, 430 *sq.*; his pride in his Syrian nationality, *ibid.*; his account of himself in his poems is not historically true, 431; his success in pathos, soliloquy, and pictorial epithets, *ibid.*; on philosophy, 425; his poem *On Spring*, 432; quoted, 458.

Melite and Narthakion, 178.

Memmius, L., visit of, to Egypt, 56.

Memnon, vocal statue of, 279.

Memphis, Serapeum at, a centre of monastic life, 219; visited by Strabo, 281.

Menander, king of Bactria, 24; his death, 25.

Menander, the comic poet: commended by Plutarch, 380; and Dion, 438; suitable for recitation at dinner parties, 388; his *Superstitious Man*, 368.

Menches, Papers of, 55, 56, 57.

Menippus, Cicero's instructor, 151.

Menkara, the pyramid of, Strabo's falsehood regarding, 281.

Mercantile decay, of older Hellas, 298.

Mercenary service, 63.

Messene, expels philosophers, 92.

Metellus Macedonicus, brings Greek architects to Rome, 134.

Metrodorus of Scepsis, 76, 93.

Meyer, on the Greek epigram, 428.

Michel (*Recueil*), 115, 118.

Micipsa, King, 256.

Milesian Tales, 343.

Miletus, antiquity of, 267.

Military: system, inefficiency of the old Roman, shown in the Mithradatic wars, 142; colonies, of Alexander and the Romans, 235.

Milne, *Roman Egypt*, 281, 288, 289, 295.

Mimes, of Herondas and Sophron, 290; in *Oxyrynchus Papyri*, *ibid.*

Mining: in Pontus and Egypt, 11; in Nubia, 77; at Laurium, 231, 313; Greek, discouraged by Rome, 313.

Minyæ, the, 365.

Miracles, belief in, of Asiatic Greeks, 131 *sq.*

Mithra, worship of, in Greece, 361, 402.

Mithradates, 112; and the Cimmerian Bosphorus, 116; his barbarism, 119; welcomed by Athenians owing to their jealousy of Delos, 140; an Iranian, 142; his policy regarding Hellenism, 143; his beneficent treatment of Pontus and Cappadocia, 268.

MDI., *vide sub Ath. Mitth.*

Mnaseas of Patræ, 76.

Molo of Rhodes, Cicero's teacher, 150, 158.

Mommsen, Th., *Römische Geschicht*
84; on Figulus, 105, 109, 205; places
extravagant faith in Strabo, 227
Hermes), 179.

Monarch, a magisterial title, 116.

, Roman, at Athe
Moonlighters, at Chær
Moral ideal, value of
by the Neo-Pythagor
Mrikkatika, the, the
Indian drama, 34.
Müller, C.: *Hist. Græ*
211, 280, 419, 435; *Ge*
76, 78.
Museum, the, at Alex
of, 69: teachers cons
the Fellows criticised
Musonius, 320.
Mylasa, 263.
Myron, works of, stolen
Mystagogi (=*cicerones*
Mytilene, privileges
Theophanes, 272.

Nævius, 109, 110.
Names, of the inhabitan
51.
Naples: as centre of (
147, 246; Museum of, 2
Narthakion, 178, 360.
Nasamones, 426.
National character, con
regards the Hellenistic
Native Egyptians, emp
diers, 54.
Native priesthood, of Eg
Ptolemies, 49.
Naturalism, craze of, 337
to, in Plutarch, 341, 378.
Neapolis, 147, 246.
νεκροκορίνθια, 190.
Neleids, the, 267.
Neo-Platonism, a reactio
lecticism, 80

Orchomenos, the rites of, 365.

Orgiastic religions of the East: adopted by the Greeks, 214; their influence on trade and morals, 264.

Oropus, *senatus consultum* on, 179.

Oscan art, at Pompeii, 251.

Osiris, worship of, by Greeks, 361, 366.

Ostia, 231.

Overbeck, *Griechische Plastik*, on the great temple at Pompeii, 251; on the temple of Isis and the stucco-work of Pompeii, 253, 262.

Ovid's *Heroides*, paraphrases of the *Epistolographi Græci* in, 441.

Oxyrynchus, 42.

Oxyrynchus Papyri, *vide sub* Grenfell and Hunt.

Pæstum, temple at, 251.

Pætus, Cicero's correspondent, 181.

Pa-khem, 238.

Palimbothra (Pataliputra), 20, 28.

Panætius, the founder of Roman Stoicism, 108, 157, etc.

Panegyris, as a financial asset, 270.

Panopolis, inscription from, quoted, 238.

Panticapæum, 143.

Papyri: *Berlin*, 290; *Oxyrynchus*, *vide sub* Grenfell and Hunt; *Petrie*, 46, 55, 57; *Rainer*, 290; *Tebtunis*, 44, 54, 55; *Turin*, 48.

Papyrus plant: cultivation of the, in the Delta, 282; monopoly of the, *ibid.*

"Parasites of Apollo," nickname of Delians, 137.

Paris, M.: the house-architecture at Delos, 254; on Greek festivals, 309.

Parisades, the last king of Cimmerian Bosphorus, 116.

Paros, marble quarries of, 298.

Parthia, 204 *sq.*; foundation of the kingdom of, 24.

Party government, Plutarch on, 352.

Patara, 239.

Patavium, 229.

Paté de foie gras, condemned by Plutarch as sinfully luxurious, 386.

Patræ, 227, 298, 301, 319; pirates at, 186.

Patro, the Epicurean, 155.

Patronage of authors, 84.

Paul, St.: *Epistles* of, 266; his visits to Greece, 314 *sq.*

Pausanias: *Achaica* of, 267; on Eurycles, 307; on Platæa, 345; on primitive cults of Greece, 365.

Paxanguita (Badajos), 232.

Pax Romana, the, 224, 225; in Asia Minor, 262.

Pekin, compared with Emporiæ, 228.

Pella, 67.

Pergamum: effect of art treasures of, on Roman taste, 134; mythical foundation of, 267; *vide sub* Attalus.

Pergræcari 147.

περιηγητής, 76.

Periplus, the, 82.

Peripoltas, 184.

Perjury, regarded as a venial offence by Greeks, 165, 396.

Persæ, the, of Timotheus, 57.

Perseus, Greek identification of, with the Egyptian Pahrison, 238.

Pessinus, priest-rulers of, 263.

Peter the Great, compared with Mithradates, 143.

Petilius, Q., and the pseudo-writings of Numa, 90.

Petrie, Flinders, 79.

Petrie Papyri, 46, 55, 57, 78.

Phalanx system, in Greek armies, 55.

Phanias, Antiochus Sidetes' rescript to, 62.

Philadelphia, earthquakes at, 262.

Philip, King, and the harper, 393.

Philip of Thessalonica, the anthologist, 433 *sq.*; his epigrams quoted, on Augustus' elephants, on Agrippa's mole, on book-worms, 459; on Heras, the athlete, 460.

Philiscus and Alcius, 92.

Phillips, Stephen, his *Herod*, 200.

Philo, arsenal of, 126.

Philo (*Leg. in Caium*), 219, 278, 295, 410; on Augustus' Hellenistic sympathies, 205; on the populace of Alexandria, 283; on exile, 404; on the *diaspora* of the Jews, 417; on Herod Agrippa, 418.

Philo, the scholarch of the New Academy, Cicero's teacher, 150, 182.

Philodemus of Gadara, the Epicurean, Piso's companion: censured by Cicero, 160, 431; on music, 161, 162; his writings found at Herculaneum, 255; he illustrates the severance of Hellenistic science and literature, 424.

Philokles, honorary inscription to, 137.

Philosophers: expulsion of, from Syria, 61, 86; Syria as the birthplace of, 86; expulsion from Rome and Messene, 92; as tutors at Rome, 108; baiting of, in Dion's time, 425; Horace and Persius on the, 425.

Philosophy: *vide sub* Academy, Carneades, Eclecticism, Epicureanism, Essenes, Pyrrho, Neo-Pythagoreanism, Scepticism, Stoicism, etc., etc.: vitality of the schools and insignificance of the scholarchs, 86; no important advance in, during the Hellenistic age, 87; impostors in, 121 *sq.*; political bias of, 112; called a trade by Meleager, 425.

Philostratus (*Vita Apoll.*), 31; on the statuaries at Athens, 298; on the ignorance of Greek of a Roman governor, 303; on Vespasian's administration of Greece, 314; on the projected canal through the isthmus, 320; on "wild men of the woods," 337.

Phocylides, unknown to Borysthenites, 324.

Phœnicians: intolerance of, an unwarranted assumption, 234; their capacity for colonising, 232, 233; better seamen than the Greeks, *ibid.*

Photius, 7, 8, 77; on the relation of Lucian's *Ass* to the *Metamorphosis of Lucius of Patræ*, 347.

Physicians, good social position of, in Greece, 385.

Picture galleries, 372.

Picturesque in Greece, Roman indifference to the, 154

Piræus, dismantled by Sulla, 126.

Pirates, 10, 136, 186, 187, 188, as slave-dealers, 7; Arabian, 79; guardships against, 138; raid on Delos, 140; Ligurian, 241.

Piso, Cicero's teacher in declamation, 150.

Piso, the "vulture of the provinces," 176; *vide sub* Philodemus.

Pithom, stone of, 79.

Platæa, gladiatorial show at, mentioned by Apuleius, 345.

Plato: his ideal monarchy discussed by Dion, 322; his dialogues not suitable for recitation at dinner parties, 388; his *Epistles*, 441; admired by the author of *On the Sublime*, 441.

Plautus, and Terence, 109.

Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.*): on Mago, 5; on convict miners, 11; on philosophy at Rome, 93; on racing factions, 287; mentions the hellebore of Hypata, 344.

Pliny the Younger, 117; correspondence with Trajan, 266, 323, 355, 413, 415; on Christians of Bithynia, 400, 445; his status in Bithynia, *ibid.*

Plotius, L., the rhetorician, 150.

Plundering, of Greeks by the republicans, 195.

Plutarch: quoted or referred to, 24, 93, 103, 119, 122, 127, 131, 164, 165, 180, 184, 195, 196, 200, 201, 218; on Sulla, Sertorius, and Lucullus, 113; on the Rhodians, 276; his cosmopolitanism, 403; on Tithorea and Hypata, and statuaries of Athens, 298; on Augustus' visit to Alexandria, 302; on Eurycles, 307; on Greek festivals, 309; on family endearments, 333; on "wild men," 337; a worshipper of older Hellas, 339; faults of, in style, his excessive garrulity, *ibid.*; compared with Wordsworth, 340; his similes and metaphors, 340; his modern spirit, 341; his remarks on Greek naturalism, *ibid.*; on the limited careers open to the men of his day, 349; as a compromiser in politics and philosophy, 349, 353, 360, 377 *sq.*; on slavery, 350; his lectures at Rome, 350; "the last of the Greeks," 351; not in favour of democracy or universal franchise, *ibid.*; on party government, 352 *sq.*; his resemblance to Polybius, 356; his portrait of the ideal citizen, 356; on exile, 357, 403; on embassies to Rome, 357; on the social unity of Greece, 359; on religion, 360 *sq.*; monotheistic, 361; his doctrine of demons, 362; on punishment for sin, 362; on God's mercy, 363; on the rites at Orchomenus, 365; on atheism, 367; his sophistical treatises, 368; his defence of the discredited oracles of Greece, 370; his ignorance of the Jewish religion and Christianity, 371; his conservatism as regards art, 371; his treatise *On the Pythian Oracle*, 372; on the education and hygiene of children, 373; on table manners, 374; his opinion of Aristophanes, 379; of Euripides and Menander, 380, 438; on *Proper Conduct at Lectures*, 380; on the avoidance of hiatus, 381; on dinner parties, 384 *sq.*; on the limits to wit and ridicule, 389, 392; on uninvited guests, 394; on life, 395; on adultery, 396; his silence as regards Christianity and Judaism, 400, 420; a bigoted Hellene, 408, 371; on the competition of euphuistic epigrammatists, 429.

Poetics, Indian, 33.

πόλις οἰκουμένη and κωμή, 16.

Politarchs, magistrates at Thessalonica, 316.

πολιτεία, meaning of the term, 351.

Political life, absence of, in Hellenic settlements in Egypt, 47.

Polybius, 54, 92, 102, 167, 225; on Roman degeneracy, 3; on the crisis of his own age, 1, 4; his silence regarding Metrodorus and Panætius, 98; on Roman education, 107; his resemblance to Plutarch in politics, 356;

his aim the same as that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 436.

Pompeiastæ, at Delos, 140.

Pompeii, 248; an Oscan foundation, 251; temple at, *ibid.*; Egyptian ornamentation at, and temple of Isis at, 252; stucco work at, 253.

Pompey, 60; restores Greek cities in Syria, 67; his illness at Naples, 168; his subjection of the pirates, 187; settles finally the government of Asia Minor, 262.

Pontus, its mines worked by convicts, 11.

Poor: hardships of the, in Dion's day, 422; advantages of the city poor as regards education, 423.

Porus, King, murder of, 19; embassy of, to Augustus, 82.

Posidonia, 39, 246.

Posidonius: his character, 74; on Apellicon, 127; his relations to Pompey, 130, 131; cf. 59, 68, 70, 115, 121, 122, 228.

Postumius, Aulus, and the philosopher ambassadors, 96.

Potamon, the grammarian, 408.

Prakrit, dialect employed in inferior parts of the Indian drama, 35.

Priesthoods, title of nobility, 264.

Prince-bishops, German, 263.

Private influence, value of, to Hellenistic communities, 407 *sq.*

Probability, *doctrine of*, taught by Carneades, 88, 98.

Prophetic foresight, a result of a holy life, 217.

Prose, Latin, 110 *sq.*; Cicero first master of, 145.

Proselytising campaigns, of Hyrcanus, 64.

προστάγματα φιλανθρωπίας, 52.

Protogenes' pictures, at Rhodes, 275.

Provincialisms, in the language of Italians, 170.

Proxeni, 359.

Psephisma, Cicero's criticism of the, 166.

Ptolemæa, at Delos, 137.

Ptolemaic armies, constitution of, 56.

Ptolemais (Menshieh), 41, 238.

Ptolemais of the Harbours, 43.

Ptolemais (Syrian), 62; siege of, 66 *sq.*

Ptolemies, change of Egyptian administration under, 289.

Ptolemy I: and the Delian confederacy, 137; his introduction of the Zeus of Sinope amongst Egyptian deities, 401.

Ptolemy II (Philadelphus), his Zoölogical gardens, 79.

Ptolemy IV (Philopator), 54.

Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), 77, 137.

Ptolemy VI (Euergetes II), 55, 78.

Ptolemy VII (Philometor), 52; conquest of Syria by, 60, 219.

Ptolemy VIII (Lathyrus or Soter II), 66, 77, 117; educated by Agatharchides, 77.

Ptolemy IX (Physcon), 60.

Ptolemy X (Auletes), 238.

Ptolemy of Cyprus, meeting of, and Cato at Rhodes, 193.

Ptolemy, son of Glaucias, the recluse, 219.

Ptolemy, son of Juba, 256, 359.

Ptolemy, the Περιηγητής, 76.

Ptoon, 308.

Publicani, exactions of, 8, 112, 288.

Public meeting, right of, in Asia Minor, 272.

Public works, waste of money on, in Bithynia and Australia, 415.

Purser, Dr. L. C., 332; on slaves mines, 78; on rival racing factions, 287; on the doctrine of demons, 362.

Puteoli: as a mart, replaces Delos, 141, 247; Agrippa's moles at, mentioned by Philip of Thessalonica, 433, 459.

Pydna, battle of, 138.

Pyramids, Strabo on the, 281.

Pyrrho's philosophy, at first scouted, afterwards popular, 88.

Pyrrhus, successes of, against Rome, 1.

Pythagoras, life and principles of, 218.

Pythagoreanism, Neo-, 218 *sq.*; books of, found at Rome, 90; its disciples at Rome, 105, 181.

Queen-mothers, as regents in the Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties, 65.

Rabbits, plague of, in Celtiberia, 230.

Rabirius, at the Alexandrian court, 146.

Rainer Papyri, 290.

Rajendrala Mithra, on the antiquities of Orissa, 27.

Raphia, battle of, 55.

Rationalism, Epicurean, in religion, 362.

Ravenna, a centre of Greek culture, 244.

Recitations: a medium of education for the Greek, 423; at dinner parties, 388.

Recognition, by means of toys and amulets—a Hellenistic element in Indian drama, 38.

Red Sea: coasting stations established by the Ptolemies on the, 78; wrecked ships left as navigation marks, 79.

"Red tape," at Kerkeosiris, 56.

Reinach, Th.: *Mithradates*, 122, 142, 143; in *Revue des études grecques*, 126; in *BCH.*, 215; *Epigraphie*, 299.

Religion: eastern, adopted by Greeks, 214, 264, 401; Plutarch on, 360 *sq.*; Greeks conservatives in, 364, 366; compromise of, with rationalism, 366 *sq.*

Renaissance, the, and stucco, 253.

Revolt, of the East against Rome, diastrous result of, to Hellenism, 113.

Revue des études grecques, 121, 126.

Rex sacrificulus, 116.

Rhetorical exaggeration, insufficient allowance made for, in modern historians of Greece, 342.

Rhetoricians, Latin, incompetent, 149.

Rhodes: succeeds Delos as guardian of the seas, 138; plundered by the republicans, 195; description of, 275 *sq.*; high sense of commercial probity of, 276; its art treasures, 277.

Rhone, the, 237.

Riots, occurrence of, rendered a city liable to lose its privileges, 272.

Riviera, the, 237.

Roads: Persian, form part of Alexander's imperial system, 235; Roman system of, a copy of the earlier Persian system, 236.

Rohde (in *Psyche*), 217.

Roman: commercial monopolity, 2; colonies of the Decline, compared with Hellenistic settlements in Syria and Palestine, 63; Hellenism, in Cœle Syria, 67; literature, original traits in, 110; governors and *publicani*, oppression by, 8, 112, 288; taste, slow to be influenced by Greek art treasures, 134; sciolists, in Greek literature, 181; features, introduced by Pompey, into Greek communal life, 205; government, of Lucania and Calabria, 245; themes, in Greek epigrams, 433; history, falsified by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 436; domination, the medium for the propagation of Christianity, 444.

Romana, the *Pax*, a delusion, 3.

Romance, found among the *Oxyrynchus Papyri*, 292.

Romans: degeneracy of the, 3, 8; lacked education suitable for a world-empire, 3; as agriculturists, 5; their brutality to slaves, 11; burdens caused by their civil wars for the provinces, 13, 15; as the protectors of Hellenism, 39; their dealings with the Maccabees, 64; as tourists, 77; as philosophers, 104 *sq.*; their architecture, household furniture, influenced by Greek models, 106; as students and authors in literature, 109 *sq.*; their propagation of Greek ideas in Gaul, 241.

Rome: the only possible capital of a world-empire, 13; philosophy at, 89; Neo-Pythagoreanism at, 219; practical not theoretical philosophy studied at, 99; adoption of Greek fashions at, 107.

Rosetta Stone, and the *Tebtunis Papyri*, 49.

Ross, on an inscription mentioning Hypata, 344.

Royal foundations: by Seleucids and Ptolemies, 239; object of, in the territories of the Lycian and Ætolian Leagues, 240.

Rubensohn: *Epigrams of Crinagoras*, 302, 432; on the laws of the Greek epigram, 427, 428.

Rufus, Rutilius, 102, 103, 175; his adoption of Greek dress, 125, 147.

Rusticus, Arulenus, a pupil of Plutarch, 350.

Rutilius R., used Greek dress as a disguise, 125, 147; cf. 102, 103, 175.

Saalfeld, *Hellenismus in Latium*, 134.

Sabæans, wealth of the, 80.

Sacrifices, bloody, objections of the Essenes and Neo-Pythagoreans to, 220.

Salome (Alexandra), 66.

Salt factory, on the Borysthenes, 323.

Samaria, destroyed by Hyrcanus, 65.

Samnites, admitted to citizenship of Neapolis, 246.

Samothrace, 214.

Sampsiceramus, 18.

Sandaracurgion, Mount, 11.

Sandracottus (Chandragupta), 19, 20, 21.

Sanskrit, the language of the Indian drama, 35.

Saracen stucco artists, 253.

Sardinia, no free city in, 16.

Satire, Roman, 110.

Sauromates, King, 323.

Saviour, expected by the slave-world, 9.

Sayce, Professor: on Egyptian Thebes, 203: on the doctrine of demons, 362.

Scævola, Q. Mucius, 102.

Scaptius, the usurer, 192.

Scepticism, 88; neo-, 214.

Schliemann, Dr., *Troja:* on Roman Ilium, 266; on the names of the Ilian populaces, 416.

Scholarchs, succession of the, 86.

Schreiber, Th., on the Hellenistic articles found at Pompeii, 252.

Schürer, *History of Israel about the Christian Era*, 67.

Scipio Æmilianus, 109, 241; patron and friend of Panætius, 101, 106; murdered on account of his sympathies with Hellenism, 148.

Scipio, L., statue of, with *Chlamys*, 147.

Scipionic circle, the, 3.

Scott, Sir Walter: *The Pirate*, 332; compared with Plutarch, 341.

Scott, *Fragg. Hercul.*, 161.

Scriptores erotici Græci, ed. Hercher, 343.

Sculpture, Indian, 29.

Scylax, 76.

Scymnus of Chios: his dedication quoted, 76, 81; his authorities, 83.

Scythians, assaults by, on Greek settlements at Olbia, 325.

Scythopolis, 67, 203.

Seamanship, Phœnicians superior to Greeks in, 233.

Sebaste, 211.

Selene, 66.

Seleucia, on the Tigris, 26, 59; its autonomous constitution, 238.

Seleucus I, his eastern policy, 19.

Seleucus Callinicus, 24.

Sema, the, at Alexandria, 284.

Semites, use of Greek by the, 250; *vide sub* Jews, Phœnicians.

Semitic reaction against Hellenism, 15.

Senart (in *Journal asiatique*), on the inscription of Açoka, 23.

Senate: missions to the Roman, from the Maccabees, 64 *sq.;* decree on the books of Numa, 90; on Stratoniceia, 119; on Oropus, 179; on Narthakion, 178.

Senatus consulta, 179 *sq.*

Senatus consultum, of Lagina, 118; about Sparta and Messene, 299.

Sentimental Hellenism, J. Cæsar's dislike of, 190.

Serapeum, the, at Memphis, 50.

Serapis, worship of, by Greeks, 366, 401.

Sermon on the Mount, 443.

Sertorius, his dream of an empire in the Happy Isles, 13.

Severus, Septimius, repairs the statue of Memnon, 280.

Sextii, Pythagoreanism of the, 219.

Sicily: slaves in, 8; Cicero on the Greeks in, 163; Phœnicians and Greeks in, 233, 244; decay of, as a corn-supply, 255.

Silanus, D., translator of Mago's book, 5.

Simon Maccabæus, 64.

Simple life, the, in Hellenistic days, 337 *sq.;* 341, 342.

Sinope, 205; an emporium for the trade of India, 268; capital of Mithradates' empire, 268; the Zeus of, identified with an Egyptian deity at Memphis, 401.

Slavery, Plutarch's views on, 350.

Slaves: employed in agriculture, 6; revolt of Carthaginian, 4, 7; Hellenistic character of the revolt, 8; second revolt in Sicily, *ibid.;* outbreaks in Italy, 10; combine with gladiators, *ibid.;* in mines at Laurium and Pontus, 11; in Nubia, 77; Delos a great market for, 138; loquacity of Greek, 390.

Smallness, incompatible with perfect beauty, 440.

Smith, V. A.: *Early History of India*, 20, 25, 31, 37, 205, 313; *Life of Açoka*, 23.

Smyly, Professor J. S., on Greek romantic novels, 292.

Snobbery, in the Hellenistic age, 354.

Snoring, a vice of the Tarsians, 273.

Sogdiana, revolt of, 22.

Sophist, the, compared with the philosopher, 377.

Sophistical literature of Hadrian's day, 421, 422, 442.

Sophocles, the Lateran statue of, 426.

Sophron, *Mimes* of, 290.

Sospis, his entertainments, 385.

Sossius Senecio: a patron of Plutarch, 350; at Ammonius' banquet, 386.

Soul, Plutarch on the, 340.

Spain, Hellenism of, 228 *sq.*

Sparta: ordeal of flogging at, 164, 365; feud of, with Messene, 299.

Spartacus, 10.

"Sports," in literature, 434.

Stark, Professor B., *Gaza*, 18
67.

States, modern, permanence
cepted as an axiom and co
with ancient opinions regard
Roman empire, 449.

σταθμός (country residence
Greek settler in Egypt), 50.

Statues: rededication of, at R
censured by Dion, 275, 278, 372
ufacture of, at Athens for e
296; complimentary, 358, 372, et

Stilo, L. Ælius, teacher of Latin
mar, 111.

Stiris, 185.

St. John's *Gospel*, cited, 420.

Stoa, Dion's gift of, to his fellow
zens, 412.

Stoicism: approximation of, to
Peripatetic school, 101; its use of
gory in religious difficulties,
adopted by Romans of the b
class, 100, 103, 106, 157 *sq.*, 182.

Stoics, Roman, 102, 182.

Strabo, 16, 22, 26, 28, 32, 70, 78, 119
130, 146, 232, 235; on mining an
hardships, 11; quotes Megasth
20; on the barbarisation of He
istic centres, 39; criticises Po
nius' account of Eudoxus, 74; on
tyrants of the Cimmerian Bosph
115, 116; on Aristotle's manuscr
127; on Corinthian pottery, 190;
eral estimate of, 224 *sq.*; his tra
ibid.; his literary dishonesty,
his *Asia Minor* a genuine record.
on Spain, 228 *sq.*;

Tact: in arranging a dinner party, 386 *sq.*; in conversation, 390.

Tarentum, 245; spoils of, 133.

Tarsus, 272 *sq.*

Taxila, Ionic columns in temple at, 30, 31.

Tebtunis Papyri, 44, 54, 55.

Teos and Lebedos, fusion of, 130.

Terence, his attempt to popularise the New Comedy at Rome, 109 *sq.*

Terentian comedy, a Roman adaptation of Menander and Diphilus, 96, 109.

Thaues and Taous, 51.

Theatres, Indian, 35.

Thebes, Bœotian, said to be on the seacoast by Apuleius, 344; decay of, 336.

Thebes, Egyptian, revolt of, from Ptolemy Lathyrus, 202, 284.

Theocritus: his *Adoniasusæ*, 290; his rustics ideal, not depicted from life, 337.

Theology, sneered at by Panætius, 102.

Theomnestus, the academic, 193.

Theophanes of Mytilene: the friend of Pompey, 130, 156, 189, 407; uses his influence in favour of his fellow-citizens, 272.

Theopompus, 438.

Therapeutæ, sect of the, 219.

Thessalonica (Therma), 315 *sq.*; *vide sub* Philip.

Thessaly, character of, in romance, 344.

Thracians, panic stricken by the artillery of Alexander, 117.

Tiberias, massacre of Greeks by Jews at, 419.

Tiberius: aids afflicted communities in Asia Minor, 262; a purist in Latin, 302.

Tigranes: at Ptolemais, 66; conquers Syria, 67, 118, 203; founds Tigranocerta, 119, 301.

Tigranocerta, foundation of, 119, 301.

Timæus, 83.

Timosthenes, 83.

Timotheus, character of his *Persæ*, 57.

Tino (Tinos), festival at, 270.

Tiro, and Cicero, 167.

Tithorea, 298.

Titius, prætor at Berenice, 257.

Toga, the: adopted by Greeks in Asia Minor, 125; given up by Romans in Hellenistic localities, 146; *vide sub* Dress, Rufus.

Togati, 232.

Tongues, the gift of, mentioned in the *Acts of the Apostles*, 320.

Toparchi, in Egypt, 68, 288.

Torre del Greco (on the site of Herculaneum), 254.

Town life, attraction of, for the Greek, 423.

Toy-Cart, the, 87.

Trade: of Cimmerian Bosphorus, spoiled by Macedonian conquest, 115; Indian, Sinope a great emporium for, 268; in Greece, 298 *sq.*

Training, bodily, Plutarch on, 376.

Trajan: and Dion Chrysostom, 307; and Pliny, 445.

Tralles, youths of, inscription to, 259.

Travellers' tales, not suitable for a dinner party, 389.

Troglodytes, 76, 79.

Trophies, set up by Herod at Jerusalem, 210.

Tryphon, a slave leader, 9.

Tubero, Q., the Roman Stoic, 102, 182.

Turamaya (Ptolemy II), 23.

Turdetani, the, 232.

Turin Papyri, 48.

Turkomans, the, 242.

Tutors, philosophers as, 101.

Tyrannicide, a doctrine derived from Greek writers, 194.

Tyrannio, the grammarian, heard by Strabo, 243.

Tyrannus, good manners of, commended in an inscription, 258.

Tyrian guild, at Puteoli, 250.

Umbræ, at dinner parties, Plutarch on, 394.

Uncleanliness, in Greek households, 398.

Unhealthiness, hereditary, common, 373.

Unity of the Deity: preached by Pythagoreans, 216 *sq.*; by Dion, 278; by Plutarch, 349, 361.

Universities, at Athens, Alexandria, Rhodes, and Tarsus, 314.

"Unknown" gods, altars to, 318.

Unpopularity: of Greek-speaking Romans, 147; of philosophers in Dion's time, 425; of book-worms and grammarians, 433, 459.

Urbes togatæ, 239.

Utica, 257.

Valerius Antias, quoted by Livy, 90.
Varenus, the proconsul, 355.
Varna, inscription from, 323.
Varro, 219; quotes Mago, 5.
Vedas, the, 29.
Ventidius Bassus, conquers the Parthians, 204.
Verres, plunder of art treasurers by, 172.
Vespasian: abrogation of privileges granted by Nero to the Greek states, 306; his Hellenism, 305.
Vesuvius, its eruption, 252.
Viereck, *Sermo Græcus*, on the Greek in *Senatus consulta*, 178, 180.
Vigo Bay, Cassiterides probably the islands in, 229.
Vindusara (Amitrochates), 21.
Virtues, domestic, lauded in epitaphs, 259, 260.
Vishnu-worship, displaced the more Hellenistic Çiva-worship, 38.
Vita Apollonii, a mere fairy-tale, 314 *sq.*
Vladimir, and Panticapæum, 143.
Volkmann (*Leben, Schriften und Philosophie des Plutarch*): on the *Consolations*, 369, 382; on Plutarch's avoidance of hiatus, *ibid.*
Volumnius, *Eutrapelos*, 181.
Vulgarity: of Epicureanism, according to Cicero, 158; of Aristophanes, Euripides and Pindar, according to Plutarch, 380.

Waldstein, Professor, 254.
War correspondent, the Greek literary retainer an ancient parallel to the, 156.
Weber, 37.
Weil, R. (in *Ath. Mitth.*), 122, 125; on the feud of Sparta and Messene, 300; Eurycles, 307.
Wescher, *Inscriptions de Delphes*, 308.
Wilcken, *Ostraka*, 281.
Wild men of the woods, stories of, 337.
Wilson, Professor H. H., *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, 33, 36.
Windisch, *Der griechische Einfluss im indischen Drama*, 37.
Wise Man, the Stoic, 218.
Wit, in conversation, 389.
Wives of Greek settlers in Egypt, of Greek extraction, 45.
Women, increased freedom of, in Plutarch's day, 399.
Wordsworth, compared with Plutarch, 340.
World-empire, the idea of a, 1, 2.
Wreckers, 332.
Wyttenbach and Bähr, on Plutarch's *Consolation*, 382.

Xanthus, the holocaust of, 192.
Xenocrates, 222; his dealings with Antipater, 94.
Xenophon, 16, 234; commended by Dion, 439.
Xenophon Ephesius, the romancist, 343.

Yavanikâ, the Indian stage curtain, 37.

Zela, a religious foundation in Asia Minor, 263.
Zeller: *Philosphie der Griechen*, 86, 101, 104, 215, 217; on the Greek *émigrés* at Rome, 92.
Zeno of Tarsus, 101.
Zeus: the Abrettene, 264; temple of, at Olbia, 325; of Sinope, 401.
Zeuxis of Blandus, 169.
Zoölogical gardens, at Alexandria, 79.
Zumpt, on the succession of the scholarchs, 86.

3 2044 037 771 698

DATE DUE

DEMCO, INC. 38-2931